

Higher criticism and the Christ /

239 S45h

102785



Shenk, John Wesley.

Life Pacific College Alumni Library

DATE DUE

239

S45h

Shenk, John Wesley
Higher criticism and the Christ

LIFE Pacific College

Alumni Library

1100 West Covina Blvd.

San Dimas, CA 91772



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/bwb_P9-BHX-121



Cordially Yours.
J. W. Sherr.

Higher Criticism

and

The Christ

12477

By

J. W. SHENK, D.D.

Formerly Editor of the OMAHA CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE



PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR BY
EATON & MAINS
150 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK



L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

Copyright, 1905, by
JOHN WESLEY SHENK

17
LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773

To My Beloved Son

WILLIAM W. SHENK

The Soul of Honor : Faithful to the Truth

Loyal to the Christ

A scholar of the first order

*Whose love and sympathy with me in
my literary labors during the last fifteen
years have been a source of great comfort,
this book is affectionately dedicated by*

The Author

PREFATORY

THIS book is brought out by a necessity of our times. It is an endeavor to set in clear and simple speech the claims of the Christ over against the theoretical attacks upon the validity of his Word. Each generation has to meet a crisis of faith. The victories of the fathers are not the victories of the children, except as the children make over for themselves the achievements thus won.

No sooner had the preaching of the gospel appeared than Simon Magus began a deceitful overture to encompass the Holy Spirit for the ends of human pride. The Holy Spirit could not be so solicited. Only those who experienced regenerating grace had the direct service of his power. Malignant hatred followed. Most of the apostles went to their death for their fidelity to Jesus Christ. The sacrifice of Calvary worked its way through the martyrs till the Roman world awakened to the fact that physical force could not reach to and overthrow the sources of the Spirit's might.

This appeal to the physical has had exemplification in every age of the gospel's awakening. But

Prefatory

history repeats its failure. Persecutions are the program of suffering for Christ's witnesses. The warfare of opposition failing on the plane of the physical, it was carried up into the range of the intellectual. The Ante-Nicene Fathers still leave us a legacy of a fairly won intellectual victory over heathenism, and over that form of intellectual culture which is ever the defense of mere sensuousness and sensuality. From this standpoint of attack Christian philosophy has formulated, in accordance with the teachings of the Word, those reasons for personal faith that have met and overcome skeptical and rancorous antagonism at every stage of the progress of Christ's kingdom in the world.

But the supreme test is the spiritual test. Like as on Mount Carmel of old Jehovah answered the worshipers of idolatry by fire, so the credentials of the living Truth to-day are in the refining fires of evangelism. Here the spiritual powers of darkness and of light meet, and it requires no very trained mind to follow the indubitable evidences of salvation, through the great revival movements that have succeeded each other, as wave on wave, through the Christian centuries. The facts of conversion, of sanctifying power, the miracles of transformation in the changing of the wicked, the dishonest, and the

Prefatory

lustful into the righteous, the honest, and the virtuous, are matters for simple scientific confirmation.

We do well, in these times, to be true to the tested experiences of the Christian consciousness in all ages. The issue is drawn as fiercely to-day as in any period of the world's history, but on more subtle and misleading lines. The enemy has learned some lessons from repeated defeats. The approach is now made under the guise of fidelity and friendship, in the clad armor of a so-called Christian scholarship. The opposition and danger are all the more aggravated by this change of front. Heresy has come to wear the livery of holy confession and discipleship.

The argument for this assumed recognition of Jesus Christ, while denying his redeeming Lordship and Deity, is that our age is an age of transition, and that our new scientific methods and discoveries have canceled the grounds of belief upon which the Christian church has historically rested. This is the specious plea given with so much confidence by learned men who occupy places of influence and who exercise a teacher's magnetic dominion over the developing minds of those who seek instruction. Our student life of to-day meets this kind of scholastic approach in nearly every state and secular

Prefatory

institution of learning, and in many of our denominational schools of higher education, throughout Europe and America. If we are asked why our young men and women turn away from the paths of their Christian fathers, the answer is here apparent.

When a situation becomes so bad that it seems impossible to become any worse, the hour of greatest hopefulness is at hand. We exhort all those who read these pages to give themselves the chance to prove the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. The law of life in Christ Jesus underlies all true development and character growth. All new human discoveries of physical and mental facts in our time, and all devised scientific methods that stand the test of criticism and come to prove their right as working systems, take on meaning and normal relation only as they are assimilated into the social plan of the kingdom, about the central person of Jesus Christ.

Let no man be deceived. This old world, as the scene of the fall into sin and disobedience, is also the scene of redeeming grace. The growth and progress of the race upward is not that of a so-called naturalistic evolution, but that of the transforming power of redemption. The risen and living Christ moves before us, and through his Spirit within us and his vicarious atonement, he is the support back

Prefatory

of which the world cannot go. The secret of the growth of civilization is to be found in the creative purpose of the All-Father, who is even now, as he has ever been, fashioning those new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. The trend and end of human civilization is the civilization of the saints. The open vision that was lost in the paradise of our first parents will be regained in the paradise of a redeemed race. They will enter in who take God's living Word as a light unto their feet and a lamp unto their path.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

CHRIST

"What think ye of Christ?"—The Pharisees silenced—Scripture testimony of Christ—Christ's claim to Deity—Pentecost a warrant of the fact—The mistaken Jewish conception of the Messiah's kingdom—Spiritual nature of the kingdom—Betrayers of Christ among modern writers—The modern parallel of the trial and condemnation of Jesus the Christ.....Page 17

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIANITY

The promised Comforter as the organizing power of Christianity—Effects of Pentecost—Dispensation of the Spirit—Foundation of Christian church in incarnation, death, resurrection, presence, and Spirit of Christ—The secret of heroic martyrdom—Ultimate universality of Christianity..... 29

CHAPTER III

THE BIBLE AND THE CRITICS

Disturbing theories of "higher criticism"—Origin of the term—Validity of sympathetic investigation—Danger in assumed skeptical attitude—The attempted reconciliation of Bible with higher critical method—Result as practical infidelity—An illustration—The common mind a competent judge of evidence..... 39

Table of Contents

CHAPTER IV

THE LUST OF INTELLECTUALISM

Attempt of critical experts to get ahead of one another—Story of a dog—Erratic intellectualism—Illustrated in immorality—As forbidden knowledge—Recognition of right intellectualism—Testimony of Professor James to erratic intellectualism—Writer in National Review of London on modern version of Ten Commandments—Paul's definition of the "natural man"—The naturalism of deism and its fatal results—Rescue through Wesleyan movement.....Page 53

CHAPTER V

MISTAKES OF THE CRITICS

Blunder of radical critics in the beginning—Testimony of the Bible in its own behalf rejected—Brought into court as an accused criminal—Criticism of critics by President Leitch—The supernatural Christ a stumbling-block to Jews and critics—Boast of the critics—A demurrer entered—Professor Beattie on "radical criticism"—Its denseness of spiritual vision—Logical tendency as seen in Germany to-day—Dr. Fischer versus Dr. Stoker—Advice of Kreutz Zeitung—Striking analogy in this country—Secret of shuffle between orthodox position and modern higher critical revamping of infidelity—Ritschlianism—Some theological professors—The theological juggler not to be trusted—The religion of Jesus Christ alone meets the requirements of reverent reason—Action by aroused conservatives—Ethical foundations in "credo"—Professor Muensterberg on limitations of science..... 69

CHAPTER VI

MORE MISTAKES OF THE CRITICS

Pentateuch a favorable battleground—"Documentary hypothesis"—Astruc, Eichhorn, Vater, Hartmann—"The

Table of Contents

Development Theory"—Kuenen, Wellhausen—Farrar on critical theories—Archæological discovery of early writing confutes claim of critics—Johnston on cuneiform tablets—Classical culture of early Egypt, Babylonia, and Canaan—Facts dug up to corroborate Genesis narrative.....Page 93

CHAPTER VII

MISTAKES RELATING TO THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

Untenability of disruption of Isaiah—Philological criticism not sustained by authorship facts within range—Historical setting an essential part of Messianic prophecy—Exiles had Ezekiel as "comforting" prophet—No recognition of a Deutero-Isaiah in Jewish records—Attempt to discredit Messianic prophecy the logical result of a false theoretical base—Mere transcendence produces deism—Mere immanence produces pantheism—Both transcendence and immanence sustained in the prophetic portrayal of the redemptive scheme through one Isaiah, son of Amoz—Isaiah a type of the true prophet.....109

CHAPTER VIII

MISTAKES CONCERNING THE BOOK OF DANIEL

Assumed confidence of critics for Maccabean period—Gradual dislodgement of critical position—Greek words of musical instruments explained—Errors of critical scholarship pointed out regarding Belshazzar, Nebuchadnezzar's return to Babylon after battle of Carchemish, the captive "children," and Daniel's "third" place in the kingdom..119

CHAPTER IX

CONCERNING TRADITIONS

No truth in critical contention that Hebrew traditions were purloined from Babylonians—Case of Masai negroes—Their peculiar identity of oral tradition with early Genesis

Table of Contents

account—Dr. Emil Reich on the incompetence and ignorance of the critical assumptions—Professor Townsend on truthfulness of Bible narrative—Critics as false witnesses...Page 129

CHAPTER X

INSPIRATION

Primary meaning—Definition in Worcester's Dictionary—Paul's definition—Holy Spirit does not inspire with error—Animals not subject to spiritual vision—Man but an animal on a naturalistic evolutionary basis—Such basis incorrect—Its critical assumptions go with it—Moral obligation incumbent upon a spiritual being such as man—His life in Christ, through redemption—The infallible instincts of beasts for preservation of their physical life paralleled by the infallible inspiration of the Holy Spirit for man's spiritual life—The possibility of spiritual life embryonic in every man—Realized in "new birth"—This life the leaven to leaven all mankind—Makes possible free communion between God and man—Interprets the Word and quickens the human spirit—Proved as the process of entrance into the kingdom of light and glory to Christian believers of all ages.....137

CHAPTER XI

SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATION OF THE SPIRITUAL

Science relates to facts and first principles—Recognized authorities in exact sciences—Facts and first principles of spiritual life—Language an imperfect means of communication—Translations not always accurate—But as one is conscious of physical life, so also is one conscious of spiritual life—The life of the Word infallibly realized by the life of the human spirit among all races and tongues—A universal testimony to the truth—Manifest in the divine reality of the early church—The truth centering in the resurrection of Jesus Christ and his presence in spiritual life—Christian experience to be scientifically accounted for—Witness Saint Paul, Luther, John Wesley, and the Welsh revival..... 153

Table of Contents

CHAPTER XII

THE BIBLE AS A TEXT-BOOK

Natural sciences have their text-books—Laws of fact changeless throughout the physical universe—In these laws human authorities think God's thoughts after him—The God of nature also the God of revelation—The laws of the spiritual life given in God's Word—The central figure and authority Christ—The Bible beyond human improvement—A perfect working system for salvation—Christ the meaning and interpretation of all ScripturePage 171

CONCLUSIONS.....179

CHRIST

HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE CHRIST

CHAPTER I

CHRIST

“WHAT think ye of Christ? whose son is he?” This question, addressed by the Christ to the doubting Pharisees, has ever a present meaning and comes to each and every individual for a personal answer. The Pharisees answered, “The son of David.” Immediately they were confronted with the question, “How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? . . . If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?” The Pharisees were silenced. Not willing to admit his Deity, they could not explain his humanity. Not so with the disciples. When they were asked, “Whom say ye that I am?” Peter answered, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” “And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father

Higher Criticism and The Christ

which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock" (this testimony to my Deity) "I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The sacred Scriptures make frequent reference to this question. The seer of old beheld the coming fulfillment of divine purpose and declared, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." And the last of the sacred writers heard him say, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." Concerning him it is said, "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

When after his resurrection his disciples had worshiped him he said to them, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the

Christ

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:
. . . and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the
end of the world."

Thus we might multiply quotations, illustrating that Jesus Christ claimed to be the Son of God; not in the sense that all men are the sons of God with respect to their creation or adoption, but in the sense that he is the "Only Begotten of the Father," being one and coequal with the Father—the manifestation of God in the flesh.

To this claim the sacred writers render fullest accord. The Old Testament worthies looked forward to him as the representative of the Deity who should come to earth to break the shackles of the oppressed and to destroy the power of the oppressor. He was to them the Messiah who should bring deliverance to those who were held in the thralldom of sin. He was to be the world's Redeemer who should so liberate the race that its progress should henceforth be upward. The New Testament writers emphasized all this with the assurance that came from personal vision. They had seen him, talked with him, beheld his glory, witnessed his marvelous works, and received his commission to go into all the world and disciple all nations, bringing them under the sway of his word and power. They knew he was risen from the dead.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

that he had ascended into heaven, and that he would be the chief factor in the evangelization of the world. They had the utmost confidence that wherever they should go in his name he would go with them. They knew that by the power of the Holy Spirit, which he had promised to send upon them and which he had so graciously given, they could face the whole world with the assurance that no power on earth, not even legions of soldiers, could successfully withstand them. There was no shadow of doubt upon their minds that Jesus Christ was one with the Father; that he was truly God as well as man, and they declared him to be "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

The conduct of the disciples from the day of Pentecost till the day of their death is explainable on no other ground than that they had the fullest confidence in the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. No greater proof of this confidence could be given than that they were willing to lay down their lives in its defense and in defense of the truth of the resurrection. They were eyewitnesses, and they could not be persuaded, even by most cruel persecution, that they were in error.

Another question confronted those who held the destiny of the Son of Man in their hands as he was on trial before the Roman magistrate: "What shall

Christ

I do with Jesus who is called Christ?" This question has also confronted the people of the centuries, and it comes for settlement to every man who hears the truth of the gospel. It may even be stated that the tribunal of to-day is not unlike that of Pilate.

In the arrest and conviction of Jesus there were three distinct agencies: First, the hating Jews; second, the betraying Judas; and, third, the indifferent magistrate who was convinced of his innocence and yet signed his death warrant.

The Jews hated Jesus because he was not their ideal of a Messiah. To them he was a bitter disappointment. He was as a "root out of a dry ground," having "no form nor comeliness," according to the then human standards. The Jews would have welcomed a military leader; pomp and display of military power would have won them to its standard; even to the sacrifice of their lives and their fortunes. But Jesus Christ was the Prince of a swordless kingdom, a condition which they could not or would not understand. He was a Nazarene; without wealth; without political influence; without education in the schools; even without position in society. His claim was, to them, most ridiculous; for were not they the exalted people of the Most High, with leaders renowned for learning, inheriting promises above all other peoples? And what would be the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

result should they bow in allegiance to this lowly individual who went about, not to antagonize the arms of Rome, but to comfort the afflicted, give sight to the blind, heal the sick, and give the dead to their friends, rejoicing in the vigor of life and health? How could they acknowledge this Jesus as their long-looked-for Messiah without being from their point of view everlastingly disgraced? Hence their answer to Pilate was, "Let him be crucified."

It was the misfortune of these Jews that they could not or would not understand the principles and power of the spiritual kingdom. Jesus declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Yet they could see only the material side of the Christ. They were oblivious to the fact that he was establishing a spiritual kingdom which should infinitely transcend any and all material kingdoms; that, while he marshaled no armies, the principles of his spiritual kingdom would turn the tide of many a battle. They did not foresee that in the struggles between material might, where the progress of the race has been at stake, the spiritual supremacy of the law of life in Christ Jesus has entered the lists as the unseen gauntlet thrown into the gage of battle. In such crises witness Chalons and Tours, Marston Moor and the Boyne, Saratoga and Waterloo.

What shall be said of those who in every age have

Christ

hated Jesus and declared, "We will not have this man Christ Jesus to rule over us"? We might mention the dishonest man, the sensualist, the liar, and the hypocrite, all of whom would evade the precepts and the requirements of service to the Christ. But we mention more particularly, as by far the more dangerous, those who have sought through means of literature to discredit the Deity of Jesus Christ by attempting to destroy the authority of the Sacred Word which prophesied his character and his coming, and which records his lifework, his miracles, his sacrificial death, his resurrection and ascension into heaven. Haters of Christ, like Voltaire and Paine, wrote their volumes with a purpose to destroy confidence in the Holy Scriptures, by means of which they sought to discredit the Christ. Other writers have followed in their wake, and volume has followed volume until there is an array of literature, great in proportions, which would also be mighty in destruction of the Word of God were not that Word like Him from whom it came, indestructible. Their answer as to what shall be done with the Christ of God is, "Away with him." It was said of the Jews, "They hated me without a cause." So to-day the hatred of Jesus Christ is without cause. Its origin is in the rebellion of men against the authority and rule of Jesus Christ in the heart and life.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

It was Judas, one of his own disciples, who betrayed him. His name has been so execrated throughout the centuries that no child is named after him. But Judas is only a type of many who have betrayed him and are betraying him to-day. Jesus Christ, once incarnate in human flesh, is to-day incarnate, and personally present, in all those forces which make for righteousness. He is incarnate in every true reform, for, as related to our humanity, "human progress is God's first law." Christ is incarnate in his cause everywhere—in the church, in the missionary field, in all Christian effort. Yet he is almost everywhere betrayed. The consideration to Judas was thirty pieces of silver. The consideration with many to-day is political preferment, or gain of gold, or power, or applause for display of literary culture. But what is the consideration with those who set up a pseudo-scholarship by means of which to discredit the supreme authority of the Scriptures, and by so doing seek to discredit the supreme authority of the Christ? What of those who, commissioned to preach the Gospel of Peace to our fallen humanity, proceed to throw such doubt upon the authority of the Scriptures as would reduce the Saviour of mankind to the level of a mere man? What of those who stand at the gateway of intellectual culture, molding the intellectual pro-

Christ

cesses of young manhood and young womanhood; who teach that Jesus Christ was subject to the mistakes and frailties of other men and that in scholarship he was inferior to many men of to-day and so is not to be relied upon in his utterances? How many would thus rob him of his divine power, and leave our humanity without a real Saviour, so, by betraying the truth, betray their Lord into the hands of sinners?

The efficient cause of our Lord's crucifixion was the indifferent magistrate. Pilate knew that Jesus was innocent of the charge made against him, yet he sentenced him to death and furnished the machinery for his execution. He did not want to crucify him, but he was indifferent to his fate. He sacrificed Jesus to pacify the Jews. And how many to-day are in the position of Pilate, having the power to destroy the forces of evil, yet who acquiesce in the destruction of morals in the social life and who say to the monsters of vice, "Take ye the innocent of the home and crucify them, for we find no fault' in them"! What shall be said of the man with the sovereign ballot in his hand who casts it in such a manner as to pacify the brothel and the saloon? And what shall be said of those in positions of power in the church and state who look with complacency upon a conscienceless vivisection of the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Scriptures in the schools over which they are commissioned to exercise control? What of the men in these same schools who emasculate the doctrines of the new birth and of the atonement as taught by the sacred writers? What also of editors of so-called religious periodicals who manifest the utmost indifference to the fate of Jesus regarding his acceptance by mankind as the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"? When seeking penitents inquired of the apostles, "What must we do to be saved?" they answered, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." But who was the Lord Jesus Christ on whom they should believe? Surely not a mere man; not simply a hero, however great and good. No, but the Son of God, the Redeemer of mankind, who had risen from the dead and who had ascended into glory. The apostles knew no other. The Saviour whom they declared was "God manifest in the flesh." It was the Jews who disputed his claims to Deity, and who demanded his crucifixion, and it was Pilate who, utterly indifferent to his claims to Deity, said, "Take ye him and crucify him, for I find no fault in him."

CHRISTIANITY

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIANITY

BEFORE Jesus went to his crucifixion he gave his disciples warning of the tragedy as it should occur at Jerusalem. They were disheartened at the prospect, and he sought to comfort them. He declared that it was best that he should go away. If he should not go away the Comforter would not come to them, but if he went away he would send them the Comforter. He further taught them that the Comforter, which is the Spirit of Truth proceeding from the Father, would give them unusual power to cope with the difficulties which they would meet in the proclamation of the Gospel throughout the world. They were not to rush into the fray in their own name or strength. They would have opposed to them the institutions of lust and sin and crime, centuries old. They would be opposed everywhere by the deceitfulness and corruption of the human heart. They would be even persecuted and slain by the iron arms of Rome. But the Spirit of Truth would go before them. He would reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. He would convince the world of the exceeding destruc-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

tiveness of sin, of the necessity of righteousness in the community and in the life, and of the judgment that awaits all forms of opposition to the reign of Jesus Christ in the hearts and institutions of men. The Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, would clothe them with such power that they would be superior to all these things. They must await his coming: "And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."

Obeing the precept of their Lord, after he had gone away the disciples retired to an upper room in Jerusalem. There they continued with one accord in prayer and supplication. The days and nights passed. Even to the eighth day no apparent change had occurred. Still they prayed and waited. It was on the ninth day, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, that they were all with one accord in one place. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were

Christianity

all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

The scenes which followed were marvelous in the extreme. The disciples numbered one hundred and twenty. They were ordinary men and modest, retiring women. Before that manifestation there was little to distinguish them from other men and women then in Jerusalem. But when the Holy Ghost was come upon them they were indeed "endued with power from on high." They met many of the multitudes then in Jerusalem, and told every man in his own language the story of the crucifixion and the resurrection of the Son of God. Nor did the matter end with the simple telling of the story. Those who heard it were seized with an irresistible conviction that the story was true. There were on-lookers who regarded the manifestations with suspicion and who declared that they were the results of intoxication. But those who were willing to receive the truth accepted it with gladness. Those who opened their hearts to the truth received also the Holy Spirit and were numbered with the disciples. The work went on, and day by day were added to their number those who were willing to accept the truth. Persecuted and scattered, the disciples preached the glad tidings wherever they went,

Higher Criticism and The Christ

telling the story, the telling of which shall never cease.

Thus was ushered in the Christian dispensation. It is the dispensation of the Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit testifying in the hearts and minds and consciences of men to the truth as it is in Jesus. "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." This testimony and this power of the Divine Spirit is Christianity as it comes from God. Acceptance of this testimony and of this power, with all that it implies, by the individual, is Christianity in the heart and life.

Certain features of this testimony as accepted by the disciples must be recognized. They were thoroughly convinced:

First, that God had become incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ.

Second, that Christ had died according to the Scriptures to make atonement for the sins of the world.

Third, that he had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven.

Fourth, that the Holy Spirit was in the world testifying to the truth as it had been proclaimed and impersonated in Jesus Christ.

Christianity

Fifth, that the gospel of Jesus Christ was to finally conquer the world through the efforts or agency of his disciples, they being endued with power from on high by the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

With these convictions, which to them admitted of no wavering or compromise, and being filled with the Spirit, the disciples proclaimed everywhere the gospel of the kingdom. They called upon men to repent and be converted. They rebuked those who were instrumental in bringing about the crucifixion of Jesus, declaring to their faces that they had killed the Lord of glory. Their marvelous assurance persuaded the thoughtful and convinced the skeptical. Their declaration that Jesus had risen from the dead cut deep into the consciences of the proud-spirited Pharisees who had been so active in procuring the fatal decision of Pilate. Sometimes they were arrested and brought before the local magistrates, and charged that they should no longer preach Jesus and the resurrection. But they refused to obey. Imprisoned and scourged, they yet declared his resurrection. Placed upon the rack, and even led to the stake and the cross, they never yielded a hairbreadth of their testimony that Jesus was risen from the dead.

It was upon this testimony that, as Christ had declared to Peter, the Christian church was founded.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Had the disciples wavered, their testimony might have been more or less discredited throughout the ages. But with testimony unflinching, and sealing their faith with their blood, there is no fact of history more conclusively established than that Jesus Christ died and rose again from the dead. They who would dispute the resurrection of Jesus Christ or the baptism of the Holy Spirit must find some explanation of the sudden change in the attitude and conduct of the disciples from abject despair when the body of Christ lay in the tomb, to that of glorious triumph when they had become convinced that he was risen from the dead. They must also find some explanation of the marvelous spread of Christianity after Pentecost. Whence came the power by which thousands were converted to allegiance to the Christ, amid the most strenuous opposition of paganism and most dire persecutions on the part of the state? Could such results have occurred without the fullest establishment of the fact that Jesus Christ was risen from the dead? Nor could this fact alone have been sufficient without the endowment of power by which the disciples became possessed of superhuman energy. It will not do to compare the spread of Christianity with the spread of other religions. The conditions have been utterly unlike. And the conditions to-day as well as the

Christianity

trend of past history substantiate the claim that all other religions shall wane, while the religion of the Christ shall go on triumphantly to the end of time. "Of his kingdom there shall be no end." His reign shall be "from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth."

THE BIBLE AND THE CRITICS

CHAPTER III

THE BIBLE AND THE CRITICS

IN the preceding chapters we have assumed that we were speaking to those who regard the Bible as the authoritative Word of God. But many have been disturbed in their faith by various theories concerning the Word of God, theories which have gone under the general term "higher criticism." Others have been turned completely away from faith in the Bible as a divine revelation. The theories advanced by many of the critics have produced the most serious confusion in the minds of many who would yet be glad to have their faith confirmed in the Book.

We now address all candid men and women into whose hands these pages may fall. While the scope of this volume does not admit of an extended critical discussion of the higher criticism, we propose to examine into some of the methods of the critics and see if their conclusions are warranted by the facts. Have they instituted and pursued methods which would naturally lead to right, or to wrong, conclusions? Will their methods stand the test of righteousness and truth, and will their conclusions be

Higher Criticism and The Christ

found indisputably correct, or be found faulty and untrustworthy? In their pursuit of knowledge concerning the Bible, have they proceeded with a devout spirit, or have they ignored the God of the Bible and recognized in the Bible, in the world, and in the universe only a potency called natural law? Must it be said of them that the Bible is in the hands of its friends or in the hands of its enemies?

What is "higher criticism"? A story is told respecting the origin of this term to the effect that a scholar was bending over his task of "textual criticism," sometimes called "lower criticism." The method of this criticism is to compare surviving manuscripts in the various languages, and secure by means of the comparison as accurately a worded text as possible. As the scholar was comparing the different texts another scholar looked over his shoulder and said, "There is a higher criticism than that." He referred to the criticism of the essential matter of the texts themselves after the lower criticism had done its work. It is the alleged object of this higher criticism to answer the following questions: Is all the matter here contained sustained by contemporary and corollary evidences? What about the inner harmony of the writing itself? Who wrote the Book or books, and when were they written? How far can the Scripture texts be

The Bible and the Critics

authenticated by a critical study of all the available evidences, such as archæology, philology, history, literature, etc.? Also when were the manuscripts finally combined in the Book as we now have it?

It will readily be observed that the results of investigation of these questions may widely differ according to the position of the investigator, or the standpoint from which the Bible is approached. The scholar who approaches the Bible with the profound conviction that it is the Word of God will give due weight to the claims of the Bible itself—its claims to inspiration, its historical data, its doctrines, and its ethical teachings. He will find much in contemporary history and literature to confirm his faith in the integrity of the Scriptures, and where there is lack of evidence from these sources he will still give due weight to the Scripture declarations, and await further evidence as it shall be dug up from the ancient past, remembering that the Bible is among the oldest of histories, and that its claims to credence surpass all other history of equally ancient times.

On the other hand, the scholar who approaches the Bible with skepticism, giving no credence to its claims to inspiration, must, first of all, reject its accounts of the supernatural and miraculous, and then he is put to the task of accounting for the mar-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

velous history of the Bible in the progress and civilization of mankind. He must therefore set up various theories, and then must seek for facts to uphold his theories.

Such is the history of the higher criticism. Devout scholars have entered into the most thorough investigations concerning all the questions involved in the higher criticism and have come out of that investigation with stronger faith than ever in the inspiration and integrity of the Scriptures. But other scholars have instituted a destructive criticism, under the name of "higher criticism," and have sought to literally tear the Bible into shreds. It is needless to say that these men, who were among the original higher critics, were skeptics and gave no place whatever to the claims of the Bible to inspiration and the supernatural. These skeptics who did not believe the Bible, and who did not want to believe the Bible, set up their theories to substantiate their position, the chief of which was that the Bible was not what it claimed to be, but that it was the result of a system of human development, by merely human agencies, through many centuries.

So these skeptics captured the term "higher criticism," and under their system the Bible was prejudged to be a kind of criminal, and placed as would be a criminal in the dock with a bad record of

The Bible and the Critics

spurious claims and forgeries behind him. Then, whatever questions came up for settlement, they were adjudged according to the theories of the prosecutors, and not according to the plain declarations of the accused. That the claims of the Bible were based upon facts two and three thousand years old did not deter these theorists. They admitted such facts as supported their theories, but rejected such other facts as did not agree with their theories, though those other facts were often more conclusive than their own.

Now, the appalling fact is that the methods and many of the theories of these skeptical critics have been adopted by certain scholars who profess to believe the Bible, but who have undertaken to reconcile the Bible with these skeptical theories. Having adopted the methods of the skeptical critics, they are often found defending the infidel theories to which these methods lead. We give the following illustration :

In a theological school in this country a professor of Hebrew and exegesis has for nearly a score of years been teaching denial of the fall in Eden, denial of vicarious atonement through the promised Redeemer, and denial of all the beginnings of human history as revealed in Scripture, even down to the time of Abraham. He also affirms that the refer-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

ences of the Christ to the Old Testament prophecies concerning himself are without foundation, and that Christ did not know the truth concerning Moses and the prophets, or that, if he did know, he did not care to correct the prevailing false impressions concerning them. He claims for himself a greater omniscience than that of the Christ, and considers himself, in matters of revelation, superior to "the uncritical authors of the New Testament."

The working out of this infidel hypothesis in any of its ramifications shows it to be of one piece. The circumscribed view which this critic allows to the prophet or inspired writer permits no backward look to our parenthood in God, as given in the book of Genesis, nor a forward look to the redeeming Christ as given in Messianic prophecy. The Deity of the Messiah is theoretically cut away because this hypothesis has no place for the transcendent Father as the true ground of all revelation. An example of the vagaries to which such critics resort in order to carry their point in the face of indubitable facts is seen in the translation by this critic of Isa. 9. 6. Note the difference of translation and capitalization between the American Revised Version and that of the critic.

American Revised Version: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government

The Bible and the Critics

shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.”

Critic's translation: “For a child shall be born to us, a son shall be given to us; and the sovereignty shall be on his shoulder; and they shall call his name Wondrous-counselor, Mighty-lord, Booty-taker, Prince-of-peace.”

That this translation of the critic is unwarranted is shown by the use of the words in the Scripture text.¹ He also does violence to the whole spirit of

¹ The Hebrew for “Everlasting Father” is אָבִי-עֶד (āvî-’äth). Here we have a conspicuous example of an unlawfully emasculated text. “Booty-taker” is made to imply some indefinite human agent. In order to accomplish this purpose the shortened Hebrew term for God, אֱלֹהִים, which is the appellation that goes before, is also reduced to merely human meaning (translated “lord,” with a small “l”), even though the omission of the *yohd* after the ל, as here instanced, is the Hebrew way of expressing especial divine significance. The Deity of the Messiah is set in the very terminology of these words. Yet a Unitarian rendering, by this critic, is given, with all the customary Unitarian license. It is a singular fact that עֶד is used in Isa. 57. 15, and is of the same meaning as the same word used in Isa. 9. 6. Even the baldest skeptic could find no excuse for rendering עֶד in Isa. 57. 15 as “booty.” Such a rendering would destroy the sense of the whole passage. (This would be the translation: “Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth booty, whose name is Holy.”) The shock is as severe as if “Everlasting Father” or “Father of Eternity,” as given in Isa. 9. 6, were rendered “Booty-taker.” But very rarely is עֶד found to mean “booty” in all

Higher Criticism and The Christ

the prophecy of Isaiah, and of the Bible, by eliminating all spiritual meaning from the passage and adopting the most vulgar translation possible.

So it has come to pass that the most profound study of the Sacred Scriptures on the part of many devout scholars has led them to the most perfect confidence in the Bible as the Word of God, and there are other scholars, so called, who have assaulted the Scriptures in the name of scholarship and in their conclusions have left little of the Bible but a tissue of falsehoods and a system of pious fraud. On account of the extreme positions of the skeptical critics the faith of many has been shaken. Not being able to enter into a critical study of the merits of the questions involved, they are as a ship without rudder, driven by the wind and tossed. Others accept, in the main, the assertions of the skeptical critics, not realizing the extent of the damage they are suffering in their religious experience,

the Old Testament Scriptures. Such a rendition of the word is not possible in Isaiah anywhere, in any sense of its use. Moreover, this consistent use of the term as meaning "Everlasting" or "Eternity" is one of those characteristic expressions that include the latter, or so-called "second," Isaiah, with the former part of the book, under a single authorship. This is an instance of how scholarship is prostituted and made to serve the ends of unrighteousness, in behalf of the higher critical theory. Even so did the scribes and Pharisees deny to his face the Truth made flesh.

The Bible and the Critics

nor the baleful influence they exert upon others. Still others are repelled by the godless methods of those who would relegate the Bible to the rubbish of legends and myths and cling with renewed vigor to the "faith once delivered unto the saints." In this crisis a genuine religious experience is most helpful, while a mere intellectualism is often caught in the toils.

Devout study of the Holy Scriptures is an essential law of progressive spiritual life. Hence it is always to be commended and encouraged. But who can withhold severest condemnation from that bald skepticism which treats the Bible as a merely human book full of fraudulent claims, thus ruling God out of the Bible and by so doing practically ruling him out of the universe? The great effort of the skeptics of all the ages has been to solve the problem of how to "get rid of God." Until within the last century those who assaulted the Bible as the Word of God were outside the church and were universally regarded as infidels. More recently the integrity of the Scriptures has been assaulted by those who profess to be Christians. Some of these are high in schools of learning, and even in the councils of the church. It is these professed Christian scholars who by wrong methods of investigation have created greater difficulties in the right understanding of the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Scriptures than they have sought to solve, and they have made so many blunders in their investigations that they may well be discredited in all their effusions which militate against the integrity of the Holy Scriptures.

We ask our readers, therefore, each one to constitute himself one of a jury, impaneled to decide upon an array of facts which we propose to bring forward, and then to declare to himself, in his own mind, as to whether the theories of these extreme critics are to be accepted as truth, or rejected as dangerous and fallacious. The question to be decided is, Have we "God's Bible or only a higher critic's Bible"?

We know it is claimed that because laymen are not as a rule critical scholars they cannot, therefore, sit in judgment on the conclusions of those who are exalted in learning and who live in a scholastic atmosphere high above the common people. "What right," say they, "has the ordinary intellect to question the conclusions of those who have spent years upon years in the study of these questions? Have we not attained the acme of learning, and who is the common man that he should dare dispute our position?"

But such a claim applied to the state would destroy our jury system and relegate our boasted

The Bible and the Critics

freedom to the star-chamber proceedings of a past despotism. A jury impaneled to hear the evidence in a case of law may never have read one of the law books with which both the judge and the counsel are familiar; but they can be relied upon to sift the evidence presented and to decide fairly upon the guilt or innocence of the accused, or upon what is justice between man and man. So the average reader can easily sift the statements of the scholar and form his own conclusions concerning the theories which are brought forward in the name of learning. If he finds a conflict of testimony he must accept that which appears to him to most nearly approach the truth. And surely he must reject that which is clearly and palpably false. The average man has often found and will often find that experts are not always reliable in their testimony, and that they are often less reliable in their conclusions. Judging from the situation as it clearly appears we feel justified in the assertion that what a large portion of the scholastic world needs to-day above all other things is a baptism of common sense.

THE LUST OF INTELLECTUALISM

CHAPTER IV

THE LUST OF INTELLECTUALISM

BISHOP HAMILTON relates that once, when crossing the Atlantic, he fell in with a renowned professor of Oxford University, who had with him a voluminous manuscript, it being a treatise on the Sanskrit language. The bishop listened during long hours of the voyage to the reading of the manuscript by the professor, and noted that in many ways he took issue with other writers on the same subject. Finally the bishop said to him, "Since you learned men differ so widely on these questions, how am I, a layman, under tribute to a strenuous life, to understand what is right and what is wrong in these controversies? My life being given up to continuous activity and not having time for a critical investigation of these questions, how shall I come to right conclusions when you scholars differ so widely among yourselves?" The professor answered, "Do you not know that we experts are cut-throats? Professor ——— has taken such and such ground regarding these questions, and I do not propose that he shall get ahead of me."

Higher Criticism and The Christ

That such is the animus regarding some of the discussions on the higher criticism there is no doubt. Sir Robert Anderson charges that "On all the main questions by the pseudo-critics they have been refuted by books as scholarly and able as any which they themselves have written. It is not their way, however, to make either admissions or rejoinders. But they turn up again unabashed." They remind one of Mr. Beecher's story of his dog. The canine had chased a squirrel into a hole in a stone wall; and though the intended victim had long since made its escape, the dog would go there every day and "bark at that same old hole." Many of the positions of the higher critics have been refuted again and again, but they continue to reiterate their theories. Or being so thoroughly routed from their positions as to make insistence ridiculous, they have taken up other positions which, however they differ in form, have the same brand of sophistry.

We define the lust of intellectualism as erratic intellectualism, or as the pursuit of forbidden knowledge. But some may throw up their hands in horror and exclaim, "Is not the pursuit of all knowledge legitimate?" Let us see. A man may wish to become informed with respect to the vice of gambling, but if in pursuit of this knowledge he makes a practice of gambling he becomes a gambler and

The Lust of Intellectualism

becomes identified with the vice of gambling. So there is no form of virtue, nor of virtuous achievement, where there is not a limit beyond which it is not lawful to go. It is sometimes said that "vice is the excess of virtue." The adage contains at least a half truth. Take, for instance, the marriage relation. It is ordained of God, and in its right exercise is calculated to produce the acme of happiness. But when that institution goes beyond the limit of one man and one woman, as husband and wife, it degenerates into conditions most loathsome and most despicable. So the honest accumulation of property is legitimate. It tends to progress and happiness in the family and in the community. But when possession degenerates into greed for gold it becomes "the root of all evil." Thus greed for possession shrivels the heart, turns the man into the tyrant, and often leads him to pursue his victims to poverty and sometimes to murder. In the good time coming men who have accumulated their millions by robbing the poor or the public will be execrated by all good men; and the robber millionaire will be regarded in much the same light that we now view the painted savage who glories in the number of scalps dangling from his belt. Both the stolen millions and the scalps represent the throttling of rivals and the murder of innocent victims.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

So also intellectualism may degenerate into that which is forbidden by being exercised against that which is right and true. The first example was our Mother Eve. She was lured to transgression by lust for forbidden knowledge. The tempter said, "In the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat."

We give place to none in our appreciation of right intellectualism. To it all the world is debtor. It sees God's handiwork in everything. It proceeds with devout spirit to unravel the mysteries of the universe. It delves into the history of the race and finds out how God has dealt with the peoples of the past. It praises God in art and in song. It searches out the problems of cause and effect. It becomes familiar with the exact sciences. It sets in motion the machinery of industrial progress. It measures the stars and sees how God has put all in movement with the utmost precision, "never a second out of time nor a hairbreadth out of place." It mounts to highest intellectual development, and, as Kepler exclaimed when he had discovered the laws of the planetary system, it declares, "O God! I thank thee

The Lust of Intellectualism

that I am permitted to think thy thoughts after thee."

Right intellectualism rejects the philosophy of Laplace, who declared the universe to be a mechanism of natural law, operating alike in past, present, and future, independent of the presence or power of an Infinite Intelligence. It sees, rather, that the exact mathematical relations in the forces of the universe issue in the will of God, in accordance with infinite wisdom. It sees how the work of the wondrous Creator is persistently going on fashioning from within the eternal structure of the "new heavens and the new earth" that are to stand in righteousness. It beholds the coming of the kingdom of God to be in harmony with the whole plan and purpose of the Author of the universe, the ultimate object of which is the spiritual life of mankind. It beholds in the Eternal Christ a fulfillment of the declaration that "all things were made by him and for him." It sees in Christ the center of all right reason, all right philosophy, all right science, all right religion, all right theology, and all right government. It beholds the culmination of the kingdom of God to be the final destruction of evil and the final restitution of all things in that glory which Christ had with the Father before the world was. Only as the Christ is made the center

Higher Criticism and The Christ

of human thought and human action can the kingdom of peace come to mankind. Heaven itself is the centralization of all things in Christ.

In what striking contrast is that intellectual culture which takes no account of moral relations. Its exploitations have nothing in common with virtue and are often for the worst possible uses. True, there are many who stand in awe of great scholarship. Men renowned for learning sit upon the throne of their glory, swaying a mighty scepter, while kings and statesmen vie with each other and vie with the populace in making obeisance. How often is this a worship of false gods! We would not detract from the honor due to any who, by intellectual achievement, have set in motion the forces which make for truth and righteousness, either in the world of letters, or of science, or of mechanical invention, or civilization. But let all true men protest against that species of idolatry which lauds any man who exalts himself "above all that is called God" by exalting himself as judge and denier of the historic truthfulness of the Scriptures. What we deprecate is an erratic intellectualism; an intellectualism that is debased; an intellectualism which directs the forces which make for evil. Nor is it less dangerous when refined into a subtle philosophy which denies the Deity of Jesus Christ and denies

The Lust of Intellectualism

the work of the Holy Spirit and the redemptive scheme for the salvation of men.

It has sometimes been supposed that intellectual culture is practically synonymous with virtue. But that it is not so is often illustrated. Instance Lord Byron's wail at early middle life:

“My days are in the yellow leaf;
The flowers and fruits of love are gone;
The worm, the canker, and the grief
Are mine alone!”

We may quote also from Mr. S. H. Young, who spent some time in Alaska carefully studying the moral and ethical situation there. He says:

“I know many college-bred men who are now saloon keepers, barkeepers, superintendents of faro tables, or the mere hangers-on and stokers for saloons and gambling hells. The worst savages I have ever known—the most filthy, hopeless, irreclaimable savages—were educated, college-bred men from Christian communities.”

Testimony comes from a hitherto unexpected source. Professor William James, head of the Philosophical Department of Harvard University, in a lecture at the Chicago University cited several instances as illustrating his assertion that schools and colleges increase crime by educating and developing criminal tendencies. He said:

Higher Criticism and The Christ

"Fifty years ago the schools were supposed to free us from crime and all forms of unhappiness and evil. We do not indulge in any such sanguine hopes at present; . . . for the schools and colleges merely aggravate the evils instead of curing them. It is true that higher education has freed us from the more brutal forms of crime, but the very education itself has put even meaner crimes in our way."

These illustrations show the dangers of an intellectualism which is divorced from a sense of moral obligation. It only trains a bad heart to be more shrewd and cunning than it would otherwise have been. It is plain that the hope of the race is not in any form or system of intellectualism that ignores God. Professor James might have gone further and said that only the power of God through the Holy Spirit can change the heart of man by giving him right impulses and right tendencies.

This is an age of intellectual development. But to what purpose? Much has resulted in good, but much also in evil. There is progress in the industrial world, in commerce, in government, in science, in education, in art, in conditions of civilization. But there has also been retrogression—retrogression by increase in systems of "graft," of concentration of capital in the hands of the few, of fraud in

The Lust of Intellectualism

municipalities, of unscrupulousness in business transactions, of laxity in morals. And who will deny that much of this latter may be charged to the skepticism of the day? Who will say that the following from a writer in the *National Review* of London is largely overdrawn?

“The evidence is abundant and is accumulating that the agnostic negation is not simply negative. Under its influence, precepts most positive, shaping the creed of no small number, have risen from the deeps. When we look at the ways of business, fashion, literature, and at social statistics, a new decalogue appears in view. What are its commandments? I seem to read among them these: ‘Thou shalt make money, have no children, commit adultery, plead in the divorce court, and, such duties done, commit suicide.’ Not the individual only, but the nation, if it loses its old Christian prejudices, will enter on its journey toward Hades. The test and proof that a mistake has been made by our agnostic philosophers are to be found in the national decay which follows on their teaching, as darkness on eclipse. And by national decay nothing else is meant than the suicide of the race, consequent on frauds in marriage, a dwindled birthrate, unlimited divorce, degeneracy in offspring, the abuse of stimulants and of pleasure, the clouding of intellect, all of

Higher Criticism and The Christ

which are fated to terminate in one disease—the denial of the will to live.”

Saint Paul referred to the intellectual nature as the “natural man,” and declared, “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God:¹ for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” To know God the intellectual life must be in subjection to the spiritual life. The intellect which is not allied with God is by its own process of action set adrift from God. Often it falls into deepest skepticism. Nor is it strange that there are men in priestly robes who, being great in intellect but lacking in spiritual life, have fallen into egregious error, and have set the current for others to follow in their wake.

¹ Ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ (I Cor. 2. 14). Ψυχικός is a definitive of ψυχή, a substantive meaning the natural animal life of man. It designates the sensuous, with its feelings, impulses, emotions, etc. As used to limit ἄνθρωπος, the generic term for the physical man, ψυχικός emphasizes the sense man of this physical, earthly life. He lives in the realm of the seen, the objective passing order, and has to do with what he can touch and hear and feel. In this sense, taking the secondary meaning of ψυχή as *soul*, we have the soul or reasoning life of the natural man, with his realm limited and confined to what the reason can find, experience, and relate in the physical world of the five senses. According to this interpretation, the natural man (ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος) is dead to the things unseen and spiritual.

The Lust of Intellectualism

When the psalmist declared, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God," he did well to add, "Corrupt are they, and have done abominable iniquity." He knew the baleful results of ignoring God. He saw that the skeptic was not alone in his error, but that he led others astray from the truth. He saw that the vice of an intellectualism which denied God led to all other vices. History has confirmed his declaration and repeatedly illustrated the truth of his plain assertion; for wherever infidel literature has been devoured and infidel notions have been imbibed by the people, vices the most debasing and dishonesty the most flagrant have flourished.

We may cite the condition of England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when deism was at its zenith. Strange to say, this infidelity had its inception in the Middle Ages in freethinking Italy, when Greek and Roman literature was reintroduced and exalted above the Scriptures. This revival of pagan literature was fostered by the papacy, and also by such leaders as the Medici, the controlling spirits of the Florentine republic.¹ It

¹ It must not be forgotten that the monasteries were the conservators of the ancient manuscripts of the Bible, and while the classic learning of Athens and Rome was exalted for a time above the Scriptures, yet a wondrous Providence used this very means to put a peculiar value upon the Greek

Higher Criticism and The Christ

found its way to France, making varying progress, and finally was championed by such men as Voltaire, whose infidel notions were imbibed by the people and culminated in the horrors of the French Revolution. It spread its blank wings over England and found such champions as Bolingbroke the statesman, Hume the philosopher, and Gibbon the historian. Despite the brilliant minds of that day, it sunk England into immoral and irreligious depths, such as would in all probability have swept her into the vortex of revolution, as it did France, but for the religious revival under the Wesleys and Whitefield.

As the vice of a skeptical intellectualism had resulted in untold vices among the people, so the virtues of godly intellectualism on the part of Wesley and his coadjutors was one of the main factors which produced a reformation that saved England the fate of France, and produced a race of stalwart, God-fearing men and women who are to-day the largest and perhaps the most efficient

and Latin codices of the Word, and the codices in other languages as well. So, through these dark centuries of rapine and struggle, while the boundaries of states were altered by the sword in every conquest, the records of Revelation were kept sacredly intact. Thus Providence appears through the foolishness and wrath of man, glorifying Christ.

The Lust of Intellectualism

evangelizing force in the world. They are also the greatest conservators of the state. Right well did Abraham Lincoln say, "God bless the Methodist Church, bless all the churches, and thanks be unto God who in this our need giveth us the churches." It is gratifying to note that not only the Methodist Church, but other churches are equally aroused, if indeed they do not even surpass the Methodist Church as evangelizing forces.

English deism did not stop in England. It passed on to Germany, and, owing to the deadness or lack of religious life, was eagerly received, and prepared the way for modern rationalism with all its attendant irreligion and skepticism.

MISTAKES OF THE CRITICS

CHAPTER V

MISTAKES OF THE CRITICS

WE hold that the colossal blunder of the radical critics is that they start out with a system of investigation of the Scriptures which at the beginning discredits the Scriptures. They insist that the Bible shall be interpreted just like any other book, by a study of its various parts, with all the light that can be thrown upon it from all sources outside the Bible. They advance no theory of inspiration. They simply investigate and report what they find, or rather what they think they find, but do not allow the Bible to testify in its own behalf. They apply the test of physical science as practically infallible. They assume a judicial attitude and rule out all testimony which is not corroborated in one way or another outside the Bible.

We affirm that this process of investigation is one of erratic intellectualism. It is like dissecting a human body to find a living soul. It treats the Bible as an accused criminal with every consideration against it. It is the process which condemned our Lord to the cross. He declared "My kingdom is not of this world." But the mental processes of the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Jews had become so materialized that they could not or would not accept any theory or testimony of a spiritual kingdom, and the testimony of the Christ was ruled out. In this same way the testimony of the Scriptures that they were written by "holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" is ruled out of court, and the system of critical investigation is reduced to a process like that of bringing a lawyer into court to testify as a medical expert, or a chemist to testify on astronomy. The claim of the Bible that "spiritual things are spiritually discerned" runs through the whole tenor of Scripture, but the higher critics, as critics, utterly ignore this claim, and either repudiate spiritual things altogether or proceed to interpret spiritual things by intellectual processes. Concerning these facts we quote from President Leitch, D.D., of Assembly's College, Belfast:

"Now, it is well known that the scholars who originated and elaborated this critical theory came to the Bible with an immovable prejudice against the religious and historical contents of the Bible. The Bible claims to be an historical record of God's dealings with man, not on the plane of nature, but on the higher plane of grace that is above nature. It is of the very essence of the Bible that it records a supernatural revelation which God gave of him-

Mistakes of the Critics

self to man. It represents God revealing himself in miracle, through miracle, and unto miracle, culminating in the miracle of the person and work of the divine-human Saviour of men. Now, the originators of this critical system, mostly German rationalists of the last century, did not believe in the supernatural, and could not believe in the truth of any record that vouched for a miracle. Their philosophy, their science, their whole mental attitude toward the universe and its laws, made it impossible for them, without a radical change in themselves, to believe that the miraculous elements of the Bible were true.

“Their theory of a naturalistic evolution of the religion of Israel slowly growing through ten centuries, and their theory of the formation of the Bible by a gradual accretion of many discordant documents written ages after the events they record, were simply their way of accounting for the Bible without believing the Bible. They must account for it in some way other than by accepting it as true, and their easiest way was by some form of their evolutionary and documentary theories. Thus these men, because of their assumptions of the incredibility of the supernatural, were incompetent to pronounce any critical judgment on the origin and contents of the Bible. Their critical conclusions

Higher Criticism and The Christ

should have no value whatever for those who do not adopt their assumptions.

“But now this theory devised by unbelievers in the supernatural has been adopted by critics who believe in a supernatural Christ. Without accepting either its premises or its conclusions, they accept the theory itself; and their scholarship is expended in seeking reasons to justify this theory and to commend it to the Christian church. The radical mistake made by these believing critics who have adopted the theory of the unbelievers is that they approach the Bible from the same side of distrust and unbelief. They come with a prepossession in favor of the truth of their theory rather than in favor of the truth of the Bible. And so when the Bible does not agree with their theory they are disposed not to question the truth of their theory, but to deny the truth of the Bible. And then they split up and mutilate and manipulate the sacred record to make it agree with their theory.

“Now, I hold that the Bible has a right to demand from every believer in Jesus Christ that he should approach it at least with respect. He should come to it with no less respect than that with which a scholar approaches an honest secular history, such as that of Thucydides or of Tacitus, without assuming that it is always wrong when we cannot

Mistakes of the Critics

prove it to be right, but trusting it as on the whole an honest and truthful book. The Bible has a right to at least thus much respect from every Christian critic; for it has acquired a character and has behind it a history that demands respect. It is not to be treated like a culprit in the dock who has a bad record against him. It is a book that has already stood the test of time through thousands of years. It has been the instrument of the highest intellectual culture, the purest morality, and the holiest religion mankind has ever known. The Old Testament and the New are in this respect inseparably bound together. The law of Moses and the gospel of Jesus Christ cannot be put asunder. No Christian has a right to approach the Old Testament any more than the New with suspicions of its honesty and truthfulness. And yet this attitude of suspicion, distrust, and disrespect is characteristic of this whole school of criticism. Its spirit pervades their whole critical system and vitiates their methods and conclusions."

So it may be affirmed that these critics who rule the Bible out of court as a witness in its own behalf are like those unbelievers in Paul's time of whom he wrote in the first chapter of First Corinthians:

"For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy

Higher Criticism and The Christ

the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

Thus to both Jews and Greeks of that day the hardest thing to accept was the supernatural Christ. That he should have had a miraculous birth and that he should have risen from the dead was incomprehensible to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek who reveled in his systems of philosophy. These votaries of intellectualism reproached Paul for preaching a gospel so improbable, so plain, and so unattractive to the intellectualism of his time. Were not their systems of rhetoric and oratory infinitely superior? But Paul declared, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." To him it was no reproach, but an honor, and a certain boon to all who would accept it. Even the Jew, with all

Mistakes of the Critics

his prejudices, and the Greek, with all his intellectual culture, his subtle philosophy, and his polished oratory, could be saved by simply accepting the Christ. They could be saved, not by processes of intellectualism, but by being born to a new life through believing on the crucified and risen Lord. Salvation could come to them, not by scholarship, but by the awakening to the spiritual life; by the awakening to that life in which both the physical and the intellectual should be dominated and controlled by the spiritual. But whether Greek or Barbarian, whether bond or free, the gospel was the power of God and the wisdom of God to all who would believe. It was the power by which to forsake sin and to lead a true life.

In what manner does the position of this school of higher critics of to-day differ from the position of the Jews and Greeks of Paul's time? Both are the products of erratic intellectualism. And is it any wonder that the difficulties of both are similar? To the ordinary higher critic¹ of to-day the doctrine of

¹The term "ordinary higher critic" is here used to characterize all who sympathize with the evolutionary school of skeptical critics. While we insist upon the legitimacy and necessity of all scholarly study of the Word, as understood in the original meaning of the term, yet none would think of calling the late Professor William Henry Green a higher critic. He was such in the truest sense. Yet, as the popu-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

the Deity of Christ and of the resurrection is a stumbling-block, and to the radical higher critic it is foolishness.

It is the boast of the higher critics that most of the teachers in our colleges and theological schools, both here and in Great Britain, accept the higher criticism in its main points. But what are we to understand by the "main points"? If by the "main points" is meant a careful and devout study of the questions as stated in Chapter III, approaching the Bible with the reverence and consideration which is its due, accepting the expressed views of our Lord and his disciples concerning the Scriptures, then all can accept them. But if by the "main points" is meant an acceptance of the skeptical vagaries of the critics who set themselves up as superior and above the writers of the Bible, rejecting all testimony of the Christ concerning the Scriptures, and all testimony of the prophets, we enter a demurrer. Many

larization of the term has come to designate the supporters of the naturalistic theory of gradual development, we must use the term not with an explanation as to its legitimate origin every time it is stated, but with reference to the common currency of meaning which has invested it. The defender of the historicity and traditional validity of the Scriptures is in no danger of being dubbed a "higher critic," although he may exceed the higher critics in the accuracy and learning of his scholarly investigations regarding all obtainable scientific evidences of the Word.

Mistakes of the Critics

scholars in our colleges and theological schools have not suffered this form of degeneracy, though many have gone entirely too far in accepting the methods of the extreme critics and are now floundering in the mire of doubt concerning their former faith. But even if the boast of the critics were true it would but illustrate the danger to which scholars are subject, namely, the sacrifice of the spiritual to the intellectual. And truth compels the admission that many young people in our universities and some young men even in certain theological schools have suffered assassination of their spiritual life in the name of the "new scholarship." The wrecks of these spiritually dead are strewn along the shores of an imperious, but none the less erratic, intellectualism.

In the face of the boast of the higher critics we affirm that there are a goodly number in our schools like Rev. Dr. Francis R. Beattie, professor of apologetics and systematic theology in the Presbyterian Seminary of Kentucky, who in his work on *Radical Criticism* says :

"If we admit the radical critical view, in regard to the natural evolutionary nature of the Old Testament religion, it will not be possible to hold supernatural views of the New. It is in our judgment a matter of life and death for evangelical Christian

Higher Criticism and The Christ

truth and life to determine whether radical critical conclusions shall be admitted or refuted."

Another mistake of many radical critics is that they are oblivious to the spiritual element in human nature. Looking only to science as the "expression of ultimate reality," they do not admit that "spiritual things are spiritually discerned," or that the truth as it is in Christ must be discerned by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." The declaration that "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," is not in their creed. Some of them speak of the "infinite energy" as practically a material substance and ascertainable only by scientific processes. These would relegate the spiritual life in man to the realm of superstition. But to relegate the spiritual element in human nature and in the Bible to superstition is to eliminate Bible Christianity from the race. Between Bible Christianity and this form of higher criticism there can be no common ground.

The logical tendency of the higher criticism as it is to-day is seen in the controversy that has been going on and is now going on in Germany, the original home of German rationalism. A prominent pastor of Berlin, Dr. Fischer, in a public address, made the following startling declaration:

"The deification of Christ has not stood the test

Mistakes of the Critics

of real historical investigation. Such great problems as those of creation, providence, prayer and its hearing, and the personality of God wear an entirely new aspect in the light of modern science. The new truths must be recognized in our pulpits and become a part of the religious instruction in our schools."

The evangelical portion of the German church was astonished at this utterance, and the conservative church press called upon Dr. Fischer and those like him to sever their connection with a church "which they no longer represent." Dr. Stoker, former court preacher in Berlin, said:

"The radicalism of modern theological thought, which has recently even found its way into the pulpits, as is seen in the Fischer case in Berlin, is so subversive of the essentials of Christianity that it is more than an open question whether its champions can be regarded as members of the Christian church. Their denial of practically all that conservative believers regard as the very foundation of Christianity, such as the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, the Trinity, the atonement, and the divinity of Christ, virtually puts them outside the pale of the historical evangelical church. There is no common ground between the old and the new schools of theology. It is time to decide what ought to be done in the matter. Evidently the best course would be

Higher Criticism and The Christ

to separate peacefully the liberals from the Protestant churches. They represent no type of Protestant Christianity. They are teachers of a new religion."

The same conviction was expressed and advice given to the radicals by the *Kreutz Zeitung* of Berlin, the chief conservative organ of the Protestant laity. To all these Dr. Rade, of the *Christliche Welt*, organ of the radicals, replied, declaring that "the present condition of affairs in the Protestant church cannot continue." He demanded that the withholding of the name "Christian" from them should stop. He recognized the fact that there are "far-reaching disagreements between the various schools of Protestant theology," and that "we moderns will risk anything rather than leave the church. We want to stay in the church because we feel that we belong there. But something must be done to reach a better agreement between the contending brethren." He wished a freer discussion of the points at issue, and a greater liberality on the part of the conservatives toward the "advanced thinkers." To this demand the *Leipzig Kirchenzeitung*, in behalf of the conservatives, replied:

"The new theology strikes at the very heart of Christianity. The important question for the church is this: 'What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?' The Christian church stands or falls with

Mistakes of the Critics

the second article of the Apostles' Creed. Christianity throughout the world, no matter how many denominations it is divided into, is a unit in the confession that Jesus is the true Son of God, who came down from heaven and upon the cross sacrificed his life for the sins of the world. This is the kernel of Christianity, yet in the sense that it is confessed by the historic churches of Christianity it is denied by the advanced theologians. Where, then, can there be found a common ground for discussion and debate, or a possibility of an understanding between the two schools? Dr. Rade's proposal offers not the slightest chance of effecting the purpose desired."

By this discussion it will be observed that the object of the "moderns," as they now call themselves in Germany, is to remain in the church and revolutionize it to their way of thinking. But the plea that they are still "Christian" does not destroy the fact that they are the exponents of such positions as have been held by the noted skeptics of former and modern times. Most of their chief contentions have been repeatedly advanced by noted infidels and as often exploded by Christian writers.

Yet it is this proposed compromise which the German radicals are endeavoring to force upon the conservatives—a compromise which the conserva-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

tives well know means a clean surrender of their traditional orthodox position. This peculiar situation has striking analogy in our own country, where evangelical Christianity has a more vital hold upon the people. Here the radical critics are more obsequious in their ecclesiastical overtures, because they retain their places especially in our theological schools, with greater uncertainty. They are as dogmatic and unyielding in their "modern" views as the German critics. Yet they are gushingly insistent upon being counted in as Christians—and as *orthodox* Christians. So profoundly does this method of negation cut away that all mystical elements in religion are repudiated, and even the soul is denied direct communion with God. No place is left for the witness of the Spirit, as evangelicals understand it.

The secret of this shuffle between the true orthodox position of our historic faith, and the modern higher critical revamping of infidelity, is disclosed in the Ritschlian theology. As Professor Orr convincingly shows, in his critical essays on Ritschlianism, that modern type of theologian is divided between head and heart. Theoretically, a Ritschlian may be a deist, or pantheist, or what not, as Herrmann maintains, so long as his religious consciousness yields to him value judgments. He says, in

Mistakes of the Critics

other words, that a man may think as he pleases doctrinally, and yet be in full accord with vital religion. He may even be an agnostic or an atheist *theoretically*, and yet a true orthodox Christian *practically*. This illogical and destructive position Ritschl assumed as a deliverance from the skeptical philosophy and lifeless theology of his day. He held for the empirical right of a religious experience in the heart life, notwithstanding a flat denial of the reason. Hence, he could have a heart consciousness of a divine Jesus, while at the same time taking away every logical and rational ground for his Deity. So, if Jesus answers directly in religious experience to the sense of Master and Lord, it matters not to the Ritschlian whether theoretically or doctrinally his immaculate conception is denied, or his vicarious atonement, or even his resurrection. He holds religion to yield its practical values in experience, even if all grounds of miracle and prophecy, as understood in plain Scripture sense, are removed, and the Scriptures are reduced to the level of ordinarily inspired secular writings.

Sir Robert Anderson, in his review of Professor Harnack's *What is Christianity?* illuminates this Ritschlian shuffle (Harnack is a Ritschlian), wherein he points out that the Berlin professor theoretically eliminates all scriptural basis for the Deity of

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Christ, his incarnation and resurrection, and even the words of Christ, if Harnack is to be believed, become so uncertain that we do not know just what Jesus said. He theoretically rejects the genuineness of John's gospel, and gets rid of the historic truthfulness of the other three gospels, so that he has left the mere fact that Jesus was a Jew who lived and died. The gospel narrative is accounted as containing simply the "ideas" of the writers. This is Harnack's way of getting "back to Christ." Yet Harnack, in an offhand way, admits the historic soundness of traditional Christianity. He finds there the basis of a real religious experience and life.

The various German representatives of the Ritschlian school are, in matters of detail, quite divided among themselves, while they cling to the fundamental position of their master, Ritschl. For instance, Bender, at Bonn, is so uncompromisingly free in his rationalistic expurgation of the Scriptures that he is considered as going beyond the limits of justifiable liberty. On the other hand, Kaftan, at Berlin, represents a reaction against the nullification of the theoretical judgment, so that he and his followers are striving to find a rational consistency for faith. They are swinging more to the evangelical position, having sounded the emptiness of the Ritschlian ground on doctrinal theory. But it can-

Mistakes of the Critics

not be said that they have as yet parted with Ritschlian principles.

With this brief reference to the trend of the Ritschlian theology, and as the “modern” or “new” view is at war with all orthodox doctrinal systems, we have a fair portrayal of some theological professors who insist that they are *Christian*—and *orthodox*—yet who are theologically Unitarians and philosophically pantheistic. As Ritschlians, they reject the unique and infallible inspiration of the Scriptures. Inspiration, with them, as can readily be seen, allows for any degree or extent of error. With Kant, they resolve the Old Testament historic record into a secular priestly device for personal ends, thus making its laws, its supernatural history, and its Messianic prophecies a deliberate forgery. Moreover, they dwindle Christ into a mere man, who was mistaken regarding his own Old Testament revelation, and who died an unnecessary death, leaving, perhaps, fragments of “sayings” that we are not sure we can find among the unreliable gospels.

A man who can juggle with his own reason for such illogical and uncertain ends, no matter how well-meaning at heart, is not to be trusted with handling Methodist doctrines, or any other evangelical doctrines, for the instruction of candidates

Higher Criticism and The Christ

to the gospel ministry. Moreover, very little dependence is to be placed upon his mere statement that he is not Unitarian, etc., when he theoretically cuts away all grounds of orthodoxy in the matter of fact of his teaching.

If Peter had been a Ritschlian he would, perhaps, have been still warming himself by that Gentile fire, without any sense of remorse, when he heard the cock crow. Was his heart not conscious of a sense of the divine in Jesus, by declaring that he was the Christ, the Son of God, and the only One to whom men might go for the words of eternal life? Ritschlianism represents a straddle between biblical orthodox Christianity and every conceivable theoretical heresy. A "sound mind" goes with a Spirit-filled heart. The religion of Jesus Christ alone meets the searching requirements of the reverent reason. But we have it abundantly illustrated that the heart of the "natural man" is "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." How can any man in his right mind, much less a Christian professor in a theological school, deny the fact of that primal fall into sin?

The radicalism of "advanced thought" in Germany now makes honest confession that it rejects such fundamentals as the inspiration of the Scriptures, the Deity of Christ, and the atonement, as

Mistakes of the Critics

historically accepted by the church. This is but the logical outcome of the system of criticism adopted by the extreme critics. It is typical of that system everywhere. In plain words, it is the substitution of the theories of an erratic and irreverent intellectualism for the spiritual, God-given truths of the Bible. It is the cutting out of the Bible of everything for which the Bible was written. For if assumed theories and the variableness of science are to take the place of Bible declarations what can be the need of the Scriptures? Yet these "moderns" are very vigorous in the propagation of their views. Likewise are the now aroused conservatives. At the call for a convention of conservatives a vast assembly collected in Berlin, too large to be accommodated by the new Dom, and enthusiastically took their stand against the "whole radical theological tendency of the times." They declared that "Without the faith in the divine truth of the Holy Scriptures and in his atoning death and in the resurrection of the living Son of God, the church cannot exist or live or do its work. . . . The utterly subversive character of modern theology recognizes neither revelation nor the Holy Scriptures, and, accordingly, can be accepted neither as Christian nor as churchly."

Since the methods of higher criticism in this

Higher Criticism and The Christ

country are borrowed from Germany, it would be well for critics in this country to note the reaction now going on there against the bald skepticism into which their methods of criticism have led them. Let our churches also heed the danger signal. Let those who still hold as dear the Holy Scriptures and the Christianity of the Christ mark the warnings. For there are not a few in our churches, not a few in our schools and even in our pulpits, who have let go their firm faith in the Deity of Christ, the atonement, and the resurrection, holding these doctrines but tentatively, while they intensify the "ethical" teachings of the Christ; all of which shows that they are not far from the Unitarian camp.

We give place to none in highest estimate of the ethical teachings of the Christ. But what force is there to the ethical teachings of a Christ who is only the highest product of human evolution? Laudation of the ethics of a merely human Christ is patronizing mockery. An imputation of Christian ethics that eliminates the principle of divine sacrifice as part and parcel of the atonement is betrayal with a kiss. For we have no ethics which do not repose in the eternal foundation of the righteousness of the Christ. This is the inner standard of all genuine moral and spiritual life. True Christianity is not an empty structure with a well-appearing ethical

Mistakes of the Critics

veneer. Its outward form is the normal product of inner power—the power that worketh in us both to will and to do of the Father's good pleasure.

By the claims of the extreme critics it would seem that they have a monopoly of science; and by their scientific processes they assume to overthrow traditional Christianity, or, in other words, the Christianity of the Bible. But by what claim of science can they legitimately destroy the foundations of spirituality in the Christian life? The first essential of a Christian life is founded in the declaration, "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." The extreme critic places science before faith, and the difference between him and the Bible Christian is contained in the word "*credo*," I believe.

Who shall say that he has the certainties of science by which to eliminate faith from final truth? How often have the contentions of science, so-called, been overthrown! How quickly was the old conception of the atomic theory shattered by the discovery of radium! How many of the positions of scientists of yesterday have been given up by the scientists of to-day. Hugo Muensterberg, recently called to the chair occupied for thirty years by Emanuel Kant, though not accepting it, has written an essay on Eternal Life, in which he says:

Higher Criticism and The Christ

“Science—how easily is its great mission misunderstood; how often scored by its opponents for claims which it does not make; how often by its own friends pushed forward to a ground where it must fail altogether and disastrously! To honor science means to respect its limitations; science is not and cannot be, and ought never to try to be, an expression of ultimate reality. When science seeks to be a philosopher it not only oversteps its rights, but weakens at the same time its own position. What a hopeless distortion to magnify it (science) into a philosophy and a religion, and to ask science for the ultimate meaning of reality!”

MORE MISTAKES OF THE CRITICS

CHAPTER VI

MORE MISTAKES OF THE CRITICS

It would be impossible to survey the whole range of modern criticism in the limited scope of these chapters. But we desire to refer to some of the vital points, showing how the pursuit of their "scientific" investigations has often led the critics astray.

The authorship of the Pentateuch has been one of the chief bones of contention, and has been a favorite battleground of the critics. They have brought forward various theories, each critic differing in some particulars from the critic preceding him, but all agreeing substantially in the theory that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses.

Astruc advanced the "documentary hypothesis." He contended that Moses had compiled the book of Genesis from preëxisting materials. He concluded that because different names were used for God, the principal ones being Elohim and Yahveh, in different parts of the book, therefore Moses had compiled the book from previous authors. He conjectured that Moses had used twelve documents, two principal and ten lesser ones. Following him was Eichhorn, of Göttingen, who adopted the same theory

Higher Criticism and The Christ

but eliminated all but two of the documents, written, as he claimed, one by the Elohist and the other by the Yahvist writer. It was claimed that the style of writing was distinctive, and hence produced by two authors. The critics who adopted this theory supported it by reference to the twofold account of the creation and the flood. But they did not stop with the book of Genesis. They found that they could just as well apply the theory to all the other books of the Pentateuch. So, in 1815, Dr. Vater announced his conclusion that the Pentateuch consisted merely of a number of fragments. Dr. Hartmann and a number of others indorsed this position and held that various sources were used in the compilation. They also made the startling announcement that this compilation was made long after the age of Moses, the art of writing not having been sufficiently advanced for their compilation in the time of Moses. "Vater imagined a collection of laws made at the time of David and Solomon to have been the foundation of the whole; that this was the lost book found in the days of Josiah, its fragments being incorporated in the book of Deuteronomy. The rest of the Pentateuch he considered fragments of tradition, history, and law collected into form between the reign of Josiah and the Babylonian exile."

More Mistakes of the Critics

Following the "fragmentary theory" came, each in its turn, the "supplement theory," the "crystallization theory," the "modified document theory," and the "development theory." This last-mentioned theory is that adopted by Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen, and they have been followed by many modern critics. They taught that the religion of the Hebrews was a gradual development from polytheism into monotheism, and later into a spiritual system. In dividing the legislation of the Pentateuch they refer to three codes: First, the "Code of the Covenant," which they allow to be Mosaic; second, the "Deuteronomic Code," which they contend had its origin some seven or eight centuries later; third, the "Levitical or Priestly Code," contained in a part of Exodus and in Leviticus and Numbers. They hold that this code was developed after the time of Moses and completed in its present form in the time of Ezra. To illustrate these various ideas concerning the Pentateuch, Professor E. C. Bissell published a book entitled *Genesis Printed in Colors*. Selecting a different color to represent each assumed document, gloss, or "redaction," as adopted by the critics, he gave a striking illustration of their varied and confusing "crazy quilt" theories. Concerning these theories Archdeacon Farrar says:

Higher Criticism and The Christ

“The schemes which have been proposed by rival critics with so much arrogant confidence and mutual contempt have succeeded to each other in such bewildering multitudes, like waves running over waves, that we know not whether most to be astonished at their rapidity or to despise their evanescence.”

For many years the critics contended, as one of the chief foundations of their criticisms, that the Israelites and the surrounding peoples of that time knew nothing of the art of writing books; that during the time of the conquest of Canaan, and during the age of the Judges, they knew nothing of literature. It was assumed that the literary period of Israel began with Samuel. The critics pinned their faith in this theory to the fact that no inscription in the Phœnician alphabet had been discovered further back than the time of Mesha, the Moabite king who was contemporary with Ahab. “Why should there not have been found older inscriptions?” said they, “if the art of writing had been in practice centuries earlier?”

That these conclusions of the critics are mistakes, pure and simple, has been proved by discoveries in archæology. The blow of the excavator’s pick has been more potent than all the finespun theories of the critics. As proof of this affirmation we quote

More Mistakes of the Critics

from Johnston's Bible Criticism and the Average Man:

"In the year 1887-88 a number of cuneiform tablets were taken from the ruins of a city in ancient Egypt, the site of which is now known as Tel-el-Amarna. They consist of letters and dispatches sent to the Egyptian court by the kings of Babylon, Assyria, and Syria, and the Egyptian governors and vassal princes in the subject province of Palestine. They are not inscribed upon papyrus, or written in the form of the Phœnician alphabet, but are intrusted to more enduring tablets of clay, written in the script and language of Babylonia, which proves to have been, at that time, the common language of diplomacy, but disused in Palestine at a later day.

"This most important discovery proves a widespread literary activity and a considerable educational system through all those Eastern countries, running back to the time of Abraham. The most interesting of the letters from Palestine are from a certain Ebed Tob, the governor of Jerusalem. He was not governor by appointment of the king of Egypt, but an ally who paid tribute. He speaks of 'the city of the mount of Salem.' The word 'Uru' signifies city, so that Urusalem is the city of Salem, identical with Jerusalem. This Ebed Tob speaks of himself as being 'a Priest of the Most High God.'

Higher Criticism and The Christ

We turn to Gen. 14 and read the account of Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, and identify this description with that of the tablets which carry us back centuries before the time of Moses. Moreover, the 'written bricks' confirm the account in that same chapter of Genesis of the incursion of Chedorlaomer, a Babylonian prince. Let us not forget that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.

"But the most remarkable coincidence in the history of these discoveries occurred in the year 1892. Among the letters of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets are two that were written by governors of the city of Lachish, one of whom was Zimrida. One of the letters from the king of Jerusalem conveys the information that Zimrida was murdered at Lachish by the servants of the Egyptian king. In 1890 Dr. Flinders Petrie was excavating in southern Palestine, at a lofty mound known as Tel-el-Hesi. From various indications he suspected that he had identified this very city of Lachish. In 1892 the work was continued by Mr. Bliss, of Beirut. Not only did he fully identify the ancient Amorite city, but he found tablets exactly like those of Tel-el-Amarna, and upon them the very name of Zimrida occurs twice. Scarcely have the letters from Upper Egypt been translated, when their counterparts in south-

More Mistakes of the Critics

ern Palestine come to light, and the two parts of a correspondence which took place *before the Exodus* are joined together.

“The result of this recent discovery is conclusive evidence that the land of Canaan was inhabited by a people who were by no means the unlettered tribes imagined by the critics. One of the cities was named Kirjath Sepher, which means ‘the city of books’ and indicates libraries in Canaan, as there were in Babylonia. In the song of Deborah and Barak we read (Judg. 5. 14) that ‘out of Zebulun came down they that handle the pen of the ready writer.’ This is clearly the Hebrew, but on the supposition that there were no ready writers various interpretations were offered to explain the expression. But the original text is now most clearly vindicated. Moreover, the tablets show that Canaan, before the exodus, was the great highway between the Mediterranean Sea and the Eastern centers of commerce. Canaan paid to Egypt an annual land tax which was assessed according to surveys of the Egyptian government. The enlightened and warlike Amorites and Hittites were there, and many of the cities mentioned in the Scriptures are also mentioned in the tablets, such as Salem, Joppa, Gaza, Kishon, Ekron, and others. Professor Erman says: There was hardly anything which the Egypt of the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties had not obtained from Syria. The culture of the Syrians must therefore have been very highly advanced to have obtained such a conquest.

“Moreover, let it be remembered that the conquest of Canaan by Israel was only partial even until the time of David. We know also how Israel grew into intimate relations with the people of the land, and, whatever else they received of a hurtful influence, we cannot doubt that they felt the touch of their intellectual development and literary activity. Such was the literary atmosphere that pervaded the age of Moses. It was the golden age of literature in the history of the ancient East. Thus what was for many years one of the strongest assumptions of the critics against the Mosaic authorship is completely annihilated.”

On this question we may also quote from *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, by Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., the eminent Assyriologist of Oxford University. He says:

“First Egyptology, then Assyriology, showed that the art of writing in the ancient East, so far from being of modern growth, was of vast antiquity, and that the two great powers which divided the civilized world between them were each emphatically a nation of scribes and readers. Cen-

More Mistakes of the Critics

turies before Abraham was born Egypt and Babylon were alike full of schools and libraries, of teachers and pupils, of poets and prose writers, and of the literary works which they had composed.

“Egyptian literature goes back almost to the earliest period of its history. From the days of the founder of the First Dynasty onward the events of each year of the king’s reign were recorded in writing. Notes written in a cursive hand have been found in the tombs of the First Dynasty, and some of the chapters in the Book of the Dead—the prayer book of the ancient Egyptians—are older than King Menes himself. The tombs and other monuments of the Fourth Dynasty show that a knowledge of writing was already as widely spread as it was in later days of Egyptian history, and the walls of the pyramids of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties are covered with ritual texts which had been handed down from a remote antiquity.

“The Proverbs of Ptah-hotep, in fact, though written more than five thousand years ago, represent the close of a period in the history of Egyptian literature. They had been preceded by earlier books, many of which survived to a later day. One of them has come down to ourselves in a mutilated form. It is a moral treatise, the work of a certain Qaqemna, who lived in the remote age of the Third

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Dynasty. But even then there were already schools and libraries in Egypt stored with papyrus books written in a running hand.

“Egypt continued to be a literary country through all the vicissitudes of its political fortunes. It was emphatically a land of readers and scribes. . . .

“Not only the professional scribes, but everyone who pretended to be a gentleman was required to be educated. The man of business, the wealthier fellahin, even the overseers of the workmen, were expected to be acquainted with the hieroglyphic system of writing and the hieratic or cursive hand which had developed out of it. The dead man himself could not pass in safety through the perils that surrounded him on his entrance into the other world, unless he could read the inscriptions on the walls of his sepulcher or the ritual of the dead which was buried with him.

“The literary culture of Egypt has its parallel in Babylonia. There too we find a land of books and schools and libraries and a nation of readers and writers. Babylonia was a great commercial community, and for the purposes of trade a knowledge of reading and writing was required among all classes who took part in it. From a remote antiquity not only schools, but libraries as well, had been established in the numerous cities of the

More Mistakes of the Critics

country, and as in Egypt, so too in Babylonia, the literature represented in them was of the most varied description.

“The young Babylonian had far greater difficulties to contend against than the young Englishman of to-day with his simple alphabet of twenty-six letters, but they were difficulties which had to be overcome before he could even read the deed in which he leased his house or bought his wool. That education should nevertheless have been so widely diffused in Babylonia as we now know it to have been, women as well as men sharing in it, is a truly astonishing fact. The Babylonia of the age of Abraham was a more highly educated country than the England of George III.”

A few years ago the critics confidently affirmed that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because the Egyptology of the Pentateuch was so full of errors. “But a dead and buried Egypt of which Herodotus never knew has uncovered her sepulchers and brought new light to the problem.” The monuments have shown that there is not a single feature of the Mosaic record out of order with the knowledge obtained of this remote period from other sources. In the year 1889 Wilbour discovered a stone at Luxor which mentions the seven years’ famine and also the effort of one, Chitet, to avert

Higher Criticism and The Christ

the disastrous conditions. By this tablet the historical story of Genesis was thoroughly confirmed, many names and places being identified. Dr. Brugsch, an eminent German scholar, declares that the story of Joseph as given in Genesis is so historically correct that the writer might have "read his statements concerning the affairs of ancient Egypt from the very monuments themselves." Let it be noted also that the book of Genesis pictures features of a civilization which belongs to the age of the patriarchs, and not, as the critics contend, to the period of the kings of Israel and the Babylonian exile. It is the critics, not the writer of the book of Genesis, who are at fault.

The critics have contended that, because there is a repetition of the account of the creation and of the flood, the book of Genesis could not have had one author, but that it was a compilation of a later period than that of Moses. But the monuments have signally corroborated the records of Genesis in such a way as to demolish their arguments. An Accadian record has come to light which originated, as the authorities agree, five hundred years before Moses, or two thousand years before Christ, and is an account of the flood strikingly in accord with the account in Genesis. Like the account in Genesis, it has a repetition of the story. The Babylonian

More Mistakes of the Critics

record follows closely the biblical order, being a plain, continuous narrative. Since the double narrative existed five hundred years before Moses, there can be no objection to the inference that Moses may have used just such a record himself.

Again, the critics have discredited the Bible narrative concerning Ur of the Chaldees. According to the Genesis account, Ur is located in Chaldea. But the critics long contended that the site of the ancient city was on the Persian Gulf, and hence must be at least six hundred miles from the place designated in the Bible. Here again the critics were at fault, because they overlooked the fact that the river Euphrates has been filling up the Persian Gulf for thousands of years and Ur, the home of Terah and Abraham, once on the shores of the gulf, is now six hundred miles inland. The discoveries of Lenormant and Smith have established the city of Mugheir as the site of Ur of the Chaldees. The statements of the Scriptures have thus been confirmed and the assumptions of the critics correspondingly annihilated. So, by a succession of discoveries, and step by step, the declarations of the Bible are found to be correct. Who doubts that under an overruling Providence these monuments are being unearthed just in time to be of the greatest advantage in confirming the Scripture accounts.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Had they been discovered in an earlier age they might have been wasted. Now they are potent factors in exposing the assumptions of skeptical writers who would make out that the Bible is not the book of God that it claims to be.

MISTAKES RELATING TO THE BOOK
OF ISAIAH

CHAPTER VII

MISTAKES RELATING TO THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

PLAUSIBLE theories have been advanced by the critics in their attempt to rob the book of Isaiah of its accredited authorship and of its claims to Messianic prophecy. They urge philological discrepancies, dispute the traditional historical setting, and affirm that the prophecies of the book relate only to events having their causes under the immediate observation of the prophet. They also affirm that the latter part of the book discloses a maturity of thought and scope of vision too highly developed for the time in which the earlier part of the prophecy was written. That these claims are not tenable will appear from the light of various considerations.

With respect to philological discrepancies, the critics claim that the difference in style of expression in various parts of the book indicate as many different writers. It can be easily shown, however, that the critics, rather than the book, are at fault. Every close observer must note the difference in style of a writer in his young manhood and in his old age. We may instance the deliverances of Gladstone, the eminent statesman. Or if we were to

Higher Criticism and The Christ

judge the style of writing of James Russell Lowell by the standard of the critics, his works would be broken up into a half dozen unknowns, who had "redacted" after Lowell. His Biglow Papers, his antislavery poems, and his State Papers, might each be attributed to as many different individuals. Moreover, the critics ignore the fact that the internal evidences of the book of Isaiah are all for its single authorship. Certain idiomatic expressions, and certain uses of words and phrases, connect the so-called "second" Isaiah with the Isaiah of the prophecy, the son of Amoz.

In regard to the historical setting, the critics affirm that the prophecies of the latter half of the book disclose historical references to the time of the exile, nearly two hundred years after the death of Isaiah, and hence must have been written during the exile, by another person.

In this claim the critics disclose their hand in their attempt to discredit all Messianic prophecy. In denying to Isaiah the vision involved in the prophetic spirit they deny all direct prophetic reference to Jesus as the Messiah. Isaiah prophesied of the Babylonian captivity and told of the remnant that should remain. If, then, it can be shown that Isaiah did not prophesy of the Babylonian captivity it would follow that he had no prophetic vision of the Mes-

Mistakes Relating to Isaiah

siah. Hence the frenzied efforts of the critics to establish a dual authorship of the book, and to eliminate all reference to the Messiah from its utterances. In support of their position they affirm that the Jews needed a prophet during the exile to comfort them in their afflictions. Ezekiel was a prophet of the time of the exile, but no one, not even the critics, affirm that Ezekiel was the author of the "second" Isaiah. Who, then, was this remarkable personage who could write so much better (according to the critics) than Isaiah himself, and yet who fell at once into utter oblivion as to his identity? For be it remembered that the Jews have not and never have had any tradition of a Deutero-Isaiah. The Great Synagogue, composed of such men as Ezra, Nehemiah, Zechariah, and Haggai, nearly five hundred years before Christ, attributed the entire book of Isaiah to the son of Amoz. The Septuagint, the Greek version of the Old Testament, recognizes but one Isaiah for the entire book, and that came into existence nearly three hundred years before Christ. The Talmud, which contained the traditions and teachings of the Jewish fathers, and the Targums, the Chaldaic paraphrases of Hebrew law and prophecy, written after but near the time of the exile, contain nothing whatever to indicate a dual authorship of the book of Isaiah. The New

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Testament writers made frequent quotations and references to the latter half as well as to the former part of Isaiah and attributed all to one author. Our Lord referred to the prophecies of Isaiah concerning himself as of one book.

In their attempt to discredit the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah the critics seek to discredit all prophecy relating to future events. They define prophecy to mean the declaration of righteousness to the people of the prophet's own time. They affirm that the prophet could not be inspired with a knowledge of future events. They restrict inspiration to a sort of general uplift, such as an ordinary merchant might have in prognosticating the rise and fall of the market in his line of goods. But beyond this "near horizon" they do not allow that the prophetic vision could go. They attribute the claim to knowledge of future events to a kind of "medicine man" performance, or the fevered imaginations of a whirling dervish, which knowledge might or might not be erroneous.

In thus restricting the knowledge of the prophet to present events the critics restrict the power of God to inspire the prophet with a knowledge of future events. It is right at this point that the fatality of the radical higher critical hypothesis appears. If it be conceded that God is a person of

Mistakes Relating to Isaiah

supreme intelligence and power, above and independent of his creation, it must follow that he has power to inspire his created intelligences with knowledge, past, present, or future; and that he would so inspire them when, in the course of events, it might suit the divine purpose to inspire them. But the theory of the critics practically shuts out the independent individuality of the Divine Being. It claims divinity for man as the expression of God, and that man's inspiration originates with and proceeds from the divinity within himself. This is denial of the transcendence of God. It is either materialism or pantheism. The materialistic critic claims that spirit is the product of matter, and that all manifestations of mind as well have their origin in the chaos and chance of blind force. The pantheistic critic claims that matter and mind are the product of an impersonal spirit, and that God comes to know himself only in the consciousness and thoughts of men.

Having to hang on one or the other of the horns of this dilemma, the destructive critic cuts the ground from under his own feet, and is in a constant flux of theories, each as untenable as the one displaced. He has much to say about the "immanence" of God. But the doctrine of the immanence of God which discards the transcendence of the Deity is

Higher Criticism and The Christ

pantheism; and the doctrine of the transcendence of God which rejects the divine immanence, thus making the material universe independent of God, is deism.

Such are the straits of infidelity, and these are the straits of the destructive critics. In the eighteenth century deism swung out on the transcendence of God without an appreciation of his immanence. The world was considered as a machine, created and set going to operate itself by a system of secondary causes. Hence Christian revelation was not needed. The reign of law was supreme, and nature was law. But the interests of human life could not tolerate this emptying of the world of the causal and superintending presence of the Divine Spirit, and a reaction was inevitable. It swung to the opposite extreme. The infidel position is fortified to-day in a divine immanence which rejects his transcendence, thus making God and nature one and the same thing. Hence minds not illuminated by the Holy Spirit are ever seeking but never coming to a knowledge of the truth. One barrenness is vacated for another. The nature of God is revealed in both his transcendence and his immanence. In his Fatherhood he is transcendent. In his Spirit, throughout his creation and presence in his works, he is immanent.

Mistakes Relating to Isaiah

The spirit of prophecy, and especially of Messianic prophecy, rests upon this revelation of the divine nature. God the Father is not separated or removed from his human children by an impenetrable series of secondary causes. The process of redemption is organically interwoven by his Spirit in all his works. By this process his grace is made known directly and infallibly through his selected human agents. Such men are lifted up into the eternal purpose and will of God. Their utterances find an harmonious setting in the plan of salvation, whose reach embraces all time, from the fall in Genesis to the restoration in the paradise of the New Jerusalem.

Such a prophet was Isaiah. From out of his environment and time he threw the radiance of a vision that comprehended the fulfillment of his age in the final triumph of the kingdom. The genuineness of his divine credentials is attested by the accuracy of his prophecies. He lifted up his warning voice against idolatrous Judah and portrayed his vision of Jehovah's punishments. Babylon was involved within the scope of his prophecy as the symbolic embodiment of evil. Used as a means of chastisement against God's sinning people, this power itself was doomed to overthrow, and the accuracy of his descriptions throws the critics into

Higher Criticism and The Christ

confusion, for they cannot satisfactorily account for this description in the time of or after the exile. His mention of the name of Cyrus so impressed that astute monarch that he himself signed the writ that sent the children of Judah back to Jerusalem and gave them protection from their enemies.

The fulfillment of Isaiah's predictions regarding the captivity had their counterpart in the fulfillment of his predictions regarding the Messiah. Both were alike fulfilled. Coupled with his warnings against idolatry, and the consequent judgments of God, were his visions of the divine remedy for sin, as disclosed in the sacrificial corrective provided in the mission of the Messiah. What man endowed with spiritual life can doubt that the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah relate to the spiritual kingdom? Verily, he spake as he was moved by the Holy Spirit.

MISTAKES CONCERNING THE BOOK
OF DANIEL

CHAPTER VIII

MISTAKES CONCERNING THE BOOK OF DANIEL

SOME of the most virulent attacks of the critics have been upon the book of Daniel. They have been sure that it was not and could not have been written during the Babylonian exile, but that it was written several centuries later. They have piled up what they have conceived to be "historical errors" until they have seemed to be mountain high, and have given out the conclusion that their position is practically impregnable.

It must be conceded that there are some things about the book of Daniel which have given the critics a chance, from their point of view, to discredit it. But in the providence of God the positions of the critics on the book of Daniel are being, one by one, demolished. One of their strongholds has been with reference to some Greek words appearing in the text which they say could not have occurred in the Babylonian language at the time of the exile. At first the critics declared that there were as many as twelve Greek words which were foreign to the Babylonian language, and as there were no Greeks in Babylon and no communication

Higher Criticism and The Christ

between the Greeks and Babylonians at the time of the exile, therefore the book must have been written at a much later date. After a while the number of Greek words were reduced by the critics to six, and then to a smaller number, and then it was found that they related to musical instruments. So the conclusion was indubitable that, since the Greeks were a musical people, some of their instruments of music, if not some of the Greeks themselves, had found their way to Babylon. Moreover, there was communication between Greece and Babylon in the time of the exile, and why should not the court of Babylon have availed itself of the superior music of the Greeks? Professor Sayce has shown that "there were Greek colonies on the coast of Palestine in the time of Hezekiah," which was a hundred years before Daniel was born. Why, then, should not Daniel, an educated man, have become familiar with some portions of their language? Sir Robert Anderson says: "In recognition of the services of Greek mercenaries in his army, King Pharaoh Necho (possibly on the field where King Josiah fell), dedicated his corselet at a Greek shrine. And a brother of the Greek poet Alcæus won distinction in the army of Babylon at the very time when Daniel held power in the palace. That Greek musical instruments should have been used in the court of

Mistakes Concerning Daniel

Nebuchadnezzar, and that they should have carried their Greek names with them, might therefore be regarded as a matter of course."

It is claimed also by the critics that the exile did not take place in the third year of the reign of King Jehoiakim, as is declared in Daniel, and that there was no such king as Belshazzar in Babylon. But both of these claims have been found to be palpably erroneous. It is admitted by all that for three years Jehoiakim was the vassal of Nebuchadnezzar, and according to the Scripture account he suffered a Babylonian invasion the third year. But now comes the critic and declares that "It was not till the following year, when Nebuchadnezzar, acting as his father's general, had defeated Egypt at the battle of Carchemish, that a siege of Jerusalem would have been possible. Nor did Nebuchadnezzar advance against the Holy City even after the battle of Carchemish, but dashed across the desert to secure the crown of Babylon on hearing the news of his father's death."

That the critic is the one here convicted of "historical error" is shown in the fact that Carchemish is in the north by the Euphrates, and that there is no desert between Carchemish and Babylon. The historian Berosus tells us that Nebuchadnezzar invaded Palestine as prince royal of Babylon at the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

head of his father's army, and that when he heard of his father's death he "committed the captives he had taken from the Jews" to the charge of others, while he "went in haste over the desert to Babylon." So the Scripture account is corroborated by the historian, showing that, instead of hastening from Carchemish to Babylon, it was from the vicinity of Jerusalem that he hastened to cross the desert that lay between him and Babylon, while his captives, taken in the third year of Jehoiakim, were left in the hands of his subordinates to bring on to his capital. Moreover, it is known that the battle of Carchemish was fought in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, after the accession of Nebuchadnezzar, and that the invasion of Judea was during the lifetime of Nabopolassar, and therefore during the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, just as Daniel declares it was.

It should be noted also that the Bible does not speak of a general deportation in the third year of Jehoiakim. It is plainly stated that Nebuchadnezzar had brought to him captives who were without blemish, and who were, many of them, younger members of the royal and noble families. The critics affirm that these were probably boys from twelve to fourteen years of age, because in describing them the term "children" was used. But Daniel

Mistakes Concerning Daniel

declares that they were "skillful in all wisdom and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science." They were old enough to have completed a good education, which shows that they were not mere boys, but younger men of extraordinary talent. So the idea that Daniel could not have been made the "third ruler of the kingdom" on account of his extreme youth, as the critics claim, must fail of confirmation.

With respect to the assertion that there was no King Belshazzar in Babylon, the claims of the critics are going, or have already gone, the way of other assumptions, equally erroneous. It is now reasonably established that Belshazzar is referred to on one of the annalistic tablets discovered at Babylon. It is stated that "the king's son died." But the manner of his death is not stated. It is not to be supposed that the historian of the court would exploit in detail the ignominious death of the young ruler, but that he would make the briefest mention of his demise. But why was Belshazzar styled "the king's son"? Evidently because he was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. The real king was Nabonidus, who had married the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, and their son Belshazzar was acting as regent during the absence of his father, Nabonidus, who was away in command of his army at Borsippa.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Daniel is referred to as the "third ruler" in the kingdom. He could not have been the second ruler, because Belshazzar was himself the second ruler. Daniel does not state that Belshazzar became king in place of his father, but clearly implies that he reigned as viceroy in the place of his father.

The critics have tried to magnify the difficulties in the book of Daniel because it was written in two languages, partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic, the language used by the Babylonians. While it is not plain why he used two languages, it is plain that he was familiar with both languages and could well exercise his pleasure concerning them.

Another of the much-exploited theories of the critics is that the book of Daniel is not history, but a religious novel written in the Maccabean age for the purpose of inciting the Jews to take up arms against Antiochus Epiphanes. But their theory does not hold. The fact that the book is written in two languages indicates its Chaldean origin; and another fact fatal to their theory is that the book of Baruch is clearly borrowed from Daniel, and that had its origin as early as the Persian period. Daniel must have been as early. There are many other considerations which point to the captivity as the time of the authorship of this book, and though all the difficulties concerning the book of Daniel are

Mistakes Concerning Daniel

not yet cleared up they are disappearing one by one. There is little doubt that in due time all the difficulties will disappear, and that this marvelous book will stand forth upon the record as in the light of the noonday sun.

CONCERNING TRADITIONS

CHAPTER IX

CONCERNING TRADITIONS

SOME of the most strenuous efforts of the critics have been to reduce to fable and myth the personages and narratives of the Bible record. Thus Professor Delitzsch and his followers have declared with the utmost confidence that the Jews purloined their traditions from the Babylonians. But, like other claims of the critics which have become "bankrupt," this claim is proved to be without foundation. To-day the critics are at a loss to determine which are the oldest traditions—those of the Hebrews, those of the Babylonians, or those of the Masai negroes of East Africa. The imposing fact regarding the Hebrew traditions is the appearance among them of such personalities as Moses, the Prophets, David, and Jesus. Of men like these no other nation can boast.

It is agreed that in Arabia, among her "earlier, hardy, beautiful, and gifted people," all traditions relating to the early history of the human race have sprung. Different colonies carried these traditions with them from Arabia into countries where they migrated. Those who became Chaldeans went

Higher Criticism and The Christ

northeastward into Babylonia. Those who became Hebrews went northward into Palestine, while those who became Masai negroes went southward into East Africa. Others migrated into Egypt, India, Afghanistan, and Persia.

A most remarkable discovery relating to these traditions has been made recently by Captain Merger, a German military officer, stationed in East Africa. He spent eight years in the neighborhood of Kilimanjaro, gathering ethnological facts, and the results of his researches were published under the patronage of the German Kolonial Gesellschaft. The natives of that region are Masai negroes. By care and kindly usage Captain Merger obtained the confidence of these people and received from them traditions which have been handed down from father to son during unknown centuries. These traditions have been confined to a few privileged families. On certain occasions the entire kraal are wont to meet together to listen to these legends of their forefathers. They are recited by those who have been specially appointed to guard what is considered a precious national legacy. Captain Merger found that these traditions and the Bible record were so astonishingly similar that there could be no doubt of their having had a common origin.

According to the traditions of these Masai ne-

Concerning Traditions

groes, "the god of that people created all things, man and woman being the last and greatest of his creations. The story of their home in Paradise, of the temptation, fall, and banishment from Eden, is almost identical with the Bible account. Traditions as to the first murder, as to the early and great wickedness of humanity, as to the building of the ark, as to a disastrous flood, the sending forth of the dove, and the rainbow, show the most striking parallelisms with the Bible account of these same beginnings of the human family." What is most remarkable also is the fact that the Masai traditions contain nothing of Old Testament history after the giving of a code of laws. All this goes to demonstrate the early origin of these traditions, for if they had been given to this people later, and had they come through contact with the Hebrews, they would have contained traditions subsequent to the flood and the giving of a code of laws, a code given as early or earlier than the time of Abraham.

Writing upon this subject, Dr. Emil Reich, an eminent Austro-Hungarian scholar, severely criticises the methods of the critics and shows that by their adopted methods the critics are as incapable of deciding upon writings of the Bible as would be an ordinary school-teacher of the French and German language to write a reliable history of the French

Higher Criticism and The Christ

or German people. He declares that the higher critics have been unpardonably ignorant and neglectful of the essential sources of historic accuracy, such as the geography and the political and religious life of the people whose sacred writings they attempt to dissect by means of assumed philological discrepancies, and he asks, "How comes it about that the world does not see the incongruity of allowing itself to be lectured upon ancient history, upon the origin of religion, and upon subjects even more sacred, by some little German philological pedant in some little German town? How comes it that there is so little inquiry into his qualifications for making broad and generous inductions?" And we may further inquire why it is that so many of the conclusions of these obscure foreign critics are swallowed without hesitation by some of our so-called American scholars?

In concluding a discussion upon the article by Dr. Reich, Rev. Dr. L. T. Townsend, for many years professor in Boston University, has this to say:

"It would seem, therefore, that as biological science has shown that naturalism is utterly unable to account for life apart from supernatural intervention; as geological science, in harmony with Bible revelations has shown that man, instead of having been on earth a hundred thousand years or

Concerning Traditions

more, is a recent comer; as excavations in Assyria, Egypt, and southern Europe have silenced the anti-scriptural claims of the evolutionists that man's beginnings were barbarian and brutish—so too these discoveries in East Africa have silenced forever the baseless assumptions and assertions made by higher critics that the records of the Old Testament have no historic value, that they are myths and traditions stolen from the Babylonian empire.

“And how amazingly providential, to the orthodox believer, seem those discoveries that have been made from time to time, and often at the most opportune time, confirmations of the primitive view that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are a divine revelation.” It would seem, if one is sure of his interpretation of the Bible, however at variance its teachings may appear to be from the views of the world's scholarship, that, if one will wait patiently and long enough, the revelations of the blessed Book, under a clearer light, will be found, if we may judge from the past, standing perfectly secure, while the blight of bankruptcy sooner or later will overtake every theory opposed to the truthfulness and integrity of that Book accepted as the Word of God by the Christian consciousness of twenty centuries.”

In this and preceding chapters we have cited mis-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

takes of the critics, many of which have thrown them into confusion on account of pursuit of wrong methods, unwarranted assumptions, and careless investigations. We might go on through all the different books of the Bible and show that wherever they have attacked the integrity of the Scriptures they have fallen into grievous errors. We do not dispute that they have collected together certain facts. But we are not shunning facts. We are rejecting theories which are not founded on facts. We affirm that the critics have not made out a case against the integrity of the Scriptures, nor against any portion of the Scriptures. Their treatment of the Pentateuch and of the books of Isaiah and Daniel, as well as of other books of the Bible, shows that they have often come into court as false witnesses. All false theories must fail, but the Word of God shall endure forever.

INSPIRATION

CHAPTER X

INSPIRATION

WHAT is inspiration? Primarily it is the in-breathing of air into the lungs; the opposite of expiration, which is the exhaling of air from the lungs. Then it has a secondary meaning, "The act of breathing into anything." As to the further meaning we quote from Worcester's Dictionary:

"The supernatural influence of the Spirit of God on the human mind, by which prophets, apostles, and sacred writers were qualified to set forth divine truth without any mixture of error; or the communication of the divine will to the understanding by suggestions or impressions on the mind, which leave no room to doubt the reality of their supernatural origin."

In Paul's letter to Timothy it is declared that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." Regarding the Old Testament prophecies, Saint Peter declares that "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The claim to inspiration in the sense here defined is according to

Higher Criticism and The Christ

the whole tenor of the sacred Scriptures. "Thus saith the Lord" is so often repeated that none can doubt the thought of the sacred writers that they were speaking as they were moved by the Spirit of God. If inspiration be denied it must follow that the sacred writers were self-deceived; and if a form of inspiration were allowed which admitted of error, then it could not be the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, for the Holy Spirit would not inspire with error. It must be conceded that inspiration by the Holy Spirit must be the inspiration of truth, for God cannot lie.

But the idea of inspiration implies a being to be inspired. Who, then, is the being into whom the Holy Spirit deigns to "inbreath" the truth?

We may lay down as a first principle of inspiration that no mere animal can become inspired by the Holy Spirit. It is true that mere animals may partake of certain influence from their own kind, or from man. The horse may be animated with a kind of enthusiasm and seek to excel his rival. A faithful dog may be influenced to greater watchfulness by command of his master. The lion and the wolf may become possessed with cunning while in pursuit of their prey. But neither horse nor dog nor wild beast has a scintillation of moral obligation, whatever may be their skill or cunning. They can-

Inspiration

not be brought to realization of divine truth so long as they are mere animals.

It is only a spiritual being who can become spiritually inspired. If man is only an animal, though he may be admitted to be the highest form of the animal creation, there can be no ground for his being spiritually inspired. So long as he is on the plane of mere animal existence he can have no adequate idea of moral obligation, and hence no hope beyond the present life.

And it is at this point that physical science fails to make good its account of mankind. The naturalist declares that man is a mammal, a vertebrate, belonging to the family of apes. Those who espouse the theory of evolution, pure and simple, console themselves with the idea that man is the highest product of evolution. Still, according to their code, man remains a mammal, descended from mammals, and is shut within the limitations of animal life. According to their theory, man's fall was upward; having been evolved through countless ages from the lowest forms of animal life, ever advancing in the scale of being till now he has reached the climax of evolution, but still a mere animal.

So it is plain that the theory of the materialistic scientist is in conflict with the doctrine of redemption of mankind through Jesus Christ. If man's

Higher Criticism and The Christ

fall was "upward" there can be no room for his redemption, because there is no guilt from which to be redeemed. If man is no more than a mammal, and the son of a mammal, he can have no more hope than the beasts of the field for anything beyond the limits of this life: "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

But the theories of evolution as propounded by Darwin are not accepted in their entirety by the leading scientists of to-day. It has been well demonstrated that man is a comparatively recent comer on the earth, and there is no successful contradiction of the fact that man's fall was downward. It is true that Darwin discovered certain facts, and the facts as facts must stand. But there is a wide difference between the facts and some of his theoretical conclusions. There is a wide difference between evolution as a method by which events succeed each other, and evolution as a system of inductive reasoning. There is a divine unfolding and development of the world such as might be termed a continuous creative process. There is the orderly development of the human frame from the lowest form of life; but the intelligence and spirit of man is an "inbreathing" of the Creator. When God created the lower animals he gave them breath; but when he created man he "breathed into his nostrils

Inspiration

the breath of 'lives' and man became a living soul." Thus to the animal life of man was added another life—the spiritual life.

This takes man out of the ordinary animal creation and exalts him to the plane of a spiritual being who can be inspired by the spiritual God. This spiritual life was sadly marred by the fall into sin, but the promise of restoration was given by redemption through "the seed of the woman," who appeared in due time in the person of Jesus Christ. So it may be said that whatever man is, or whatever he may become above the brute creation, he is and becomes through Jesus Christ. Without Christ, as Creator and Redeemer, man is a mammal and the son of a mammal regardless of any sense of morality or obligation. But by redemption through Jesus Christ man becomes the subject of morality, obligation, spirituality, and eternal life. It is through the Christ that life and immortality have been brought to light. The primary endowment of moral obligation in man differentiates man from the animal world. It presupposes in him an inherent immortality. Man is indeed a mammal; but to the Christian believer this is only an incident of physical being. It is through Jesus Christ that man becomes infinitely exalted above the merely animal world. Our flesh is indeed related to that of the animal

Higher Criticism and The Christ

world, and so was that of the Christ. But through Christ we rise to sonship with God and heirship with him. Without Christ man is dead spiritually and eternally. With Christ man triumphs over death and becomes the heir of eternal glory. It is by redemption through Christ that man becomes possessed of spiritual life, a being whom God can inspire.

But will the Spirit of God inspire man concerning those things which relate to the spiritual life? In Job it is declared, "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." That God by his Spirit should communicate with the spirit of man is in direct harmony with all the beneficent acts of the Almighty. That he should refuse to do so is not thinkable, because it would be contrary to all his procedure in the universe of life.

With respect to the lower forms of life we see how God has endowed them according to their needs. The insect has a myriad of eyes and an instinct which it follows with unerring precision. The bee knows just how to build its cell and store its honey. The bird knows how to build its nest and rear its young. The wild beast scents its prey. All brute creation is endowed with instinct by which it is guided, an endowment of the God who created

Inspiration

them. It is by the beneficence of their Creator that the brute creation is supplied according to their needs. Nothing is lacking by which they may enjoy life within their sphere and environment. But there is no communication to the animal world concerning morality, obligation, the supremacy of love to God and their fellows, or of eternal life beyond the grave. The brute creation could not comprehend these things because they have no spiritual being. They live for a day.

But man as a spiritual being is to live forever. Since he is thus created, God, in keeping with his universal procedure, must supply his spiritual needs. For it is a law of universal application that the subjective consciousness must find its objective reality. The subjective aspirations of man's spiritual nature must have in God the objective of spiritual and eternal life. And such is the experience of those who reach out after God. No more is light adapted to the eye, producing most beautiful visions of earth and sky; no more is sound adapted to the ear, giving the ecstatic notes of voice and music, than is the voice of God adapted to communion with the soul of him who opens his heart to the love of the Infinite. That God should thus communicate with his created intelligences is not only possible, but so highly probable that it becomes a certainty. God

Higher Criticism and The Christ

could not ignore the spiritual necessities of his spiritual beings.

By what means then has God chosen to communicate with men? With those who have come within the realm of the spiritual life there is established intimate relations between the soul of the believer and the Spirit of the Infinite Father. "But ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." With this intimate relation there is a constant inspiration to do the will of the Father, and the believer realizes that "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

While many have come to a realization of the spiritual life and to a consciousness of sweet communion with the Infinite, there are many others who are strangers to all these experiences. Not only is there absence of communion with God, but there is actual enmity against God in the heart of those who "live after the flesh." "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." These reject "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." Of them it may also be said that they are "dead in trespasses and in sins." Yet it may also be said that in every human soul the spiritual life exists in embryo. This embryonic life

Inspiration

is awaiting a "new birth"—a birth into the spiritual world. This is the meaning of Christ's declaration to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again." As he had first been born into the world of physical life, so also he must be born into the world of spiritual life. In the physical life are displayed the activities of lung and heart and muscle and nerve and all the physical functions. In the activities of the spiritual life are displayed aspirations toward the infinite, the invisible, the eternal, and those fruits of the Spirit which are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, temperance, patience, "against which there is no law." In the activities of the spiritual life are all those forces which make for righteousness: the worship of Almighty God, the fight against iniquity in both the individual and the community, the pursuit of altruistic ideals, and the evangelization of the whole world by the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is in this world of spiritual forces that every soul must be born and grow, in order to develop the true life, here and hereafter. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again."

Let it be noted that the declaration for the necessity of the spiritual life by our Saviour was made to the intelligence of one in whom the spiritual life existed only in embryo. This is the divine method,

Higher Criticism and The Christ

God does not leave mankind in ignorance concerning the spiritual life. He would persuade all men to acceptance of righteousness and true holiness. That he may do this the more effectually he has made use of human instrumentalities in the revelation of his will and of the facts concerning the spiritual life. Hence we have the Sacred Scriptures. We have the Bible, the inspiration of which no one doubts who has entered fully into the enjoyment of the spiritual life. The Bible is means to an end. The end is the spiritual life of men. The Bible is the leaven placed in the midst of mankind which shall "leaven the whole lump." Of course, no inspiration is claimed for so much manufactured paper and so much printer's ink, but that the Bible, in its effect upon mankind, is a living, breathing, burning potency is demonstrated every day. No other book is like the Bible. No other book can be like the Bible.

The Bible is a spiritual book, addressed to the spiritual life of mankind. From whence then does it emanate? Surely not from the intellectual nature of mankind, which as we have seen is the natural, not the spiritual, man. Logically, there is but one source from which the Bible can emanate—the Source and Creator of man's spiritual nature, the Spirit of the living God. The Bible is the handbook

Inspiration

of God, given to men to guide them in the development of the spiritual life. That the spiritual life of God could communicate with the spiritual life of man logically follows upon the fact that God is the author of man's spiritual being.

In his communications with mankind, then, God has employed a twofold method: First by his Holy Spirit, communicating direct with man's spirit, through consciousness of spiritual life and truth, and second, by means of the Sacred Scriptures, reaching man's spiritual nature by means of and through his intellectual nature.

In giving the Bible to men it must be remembered that God used human instrumentalities. The record of God's revelation to men had to be made by means of human language, and it must be remembered that human language is an imperfect medium of communication. God communicated spiritual truth to men who were in full enjoyment of the spiritual life—that is, he gave them consciousness of spiritual truth—and they received it as the infallible truth of God. They proceeded to record that truth by the use of human language. Each writer used that language with which he was most familiar. But, whatever may be said of the imperfections of human language, it must be admitted that God so filled the writer with a consciousness of his truth that the

Higher Criticism and The Christ

latter never recorded a whit of error as related to the spiritual life. One writer might use a different mode of expression from another, but God so guided the writer that no mode of expression contained error respecting the spiritual life. Some of those modes of expression might become obsolete, and the language in which the truth was written might pass out of common use by the people. Numerous translations must be made so that each tribe and nation may read the Scriptures in their own vernacular, yet the truth remains. In whatever language the Bible is translated, it is still the fountain of infinite spiritual treasures. It is the mine of everlasting, spiritual truth. It is the only book of inexhaustible truth.

Now, it may be asked how different men shall come to a full understanding of Bible truth, when different languages differ so widely in their idioms and modes of expression. Here again comes into action the first method of God's communication with mankind. Our Lord's command was, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." Men were not merely to read the Scriptures, but to study them, delve into their utmost recesses, and find out the things contained therein concerning the spiritual and future life. When our Lord went away he

Inspiration

promised his disciples, saying, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."

Thus it is plain that men are to come to an understanding of spiritual truth by means of the revealed Word, interpreted to man's consciousness by the Divine Spirit. It might be said that to the man who is destitute of spiritual life the Bible is not an inspired book; but to the man who has attained to spiritual life in Christ Jesus the Bible is filled with an inexhaustible treasure of truth. He "searches" the Scriptures by means of his intellectual life, and the Divine Spirit takes of these things of God and interprets them to his spiritual life. So, for the understanding of divine truth, inspiration is twofold, namely, the inspiration of the Scriptures and the inspiration of the student of the Scriptures. He who has spiritual life may come to an understanding of the infallible truth of God by aid of the Divine Spirit. And he in whom the spiritual life exists only in embryo, if he will search the Scriptures prayerfully, will find the Holy Spirit present to aid him in the understanding of the truth as it is in

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Christ Jesus, by means of which he may be born into the kingdom of light and glory. This has been the experience of many thousands. It is the experience of all who are born of the Spirit. It may be your experience, dear reader, if you have not already attained to that experience. For the Holy Spirit will not leave you comfortless. "Search the Scriptures." Then the Holy Spirit will show you in them infinite treasures of which you have not dreamed. Even to those who have not known the Bible, yet who sincerely search for the truth, God's Spirit will come testifying to the truth of the spiritual life.

SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATION OF THE
SPIRITUAL

CHAPTER XI

SCIENTIFIC CONFIRMATION OF THE SPIRITUAL

ALL science relates to facts and first principles. There is the science of mathematics, the science of chemistry, the science of geology, the science of astronomy, etc. So we may designate the facts and first principles of the spiritual life as the science of Christianity. The scientist who ignores God as a Spirit applies the principles of science only to physical nature. He forgets or ignores the fact that there are manifestations just as real in the spiritual world as in the material world. He may not have approached unto these manifestations because he has not been born into, nor entered upon, the activities of the spiritual life. There is a world of facts relating to the spiritual life to which the unbeliever is a stranger. But he who has been "born of the Spirit" has entered upon a life the enjoyment of which exceeds by far the enjoyment of the physical life. He is able to adopt the language of inspiration and exclaim, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

But, says the objector, how can it be that one may become conscious of communication with the Divine

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Spirit? Then let us ask, how is it possible that one should be conscious of communication with a friend whom he does not see? You say, by means of language, spoken or written. Yes, but, as we have seen, human language is an imperfect medium of communication. Perhaps you do not fully understand your friend's meaning. But when God, by his Spirit, assures the believer of acceptance there is not so much doubt about it as there might be if the communication were in audible language. God gives the believer a consciousness of spiritual life which is just as real as the consciousness of physical life. This consciousness is the result of a spiritual quickening by the Divine Spirit and is an assurance to the believer that he "has passed from death unto life," and that he has become an adopted child of the All-Father. A child born and reared away from all human beings and knowing nothing whatever of spoken language, or one deaf and dumb, knowing not a word of human language, has just as great consciousness of life as if he were versed in all the languages of the world. So to one born into the spiritual world, and entering upon its spiritual activities, God imparts the gift of his love and fills his soul with "joy unspeakable and full of glory." Such is the testimony of thousands of the best and truest people in the world, and these are facts as scientific

Confirmation of the Spiritual

as any other facts. And may it not be said that the facts relating to the spiritual life are even more conclusive than those of physical science, since, aside from the exact sciences, the human conclusions of physical science are more or less changeable, while the manifestations of the spiritual life are essentially the same through the centuries. The testimonies of converts to the spiritual life are similar the world over. The Chinaman, the Hindu, the Bushman, the Japanese, the inhabitants of the islands of the sea, when born into the spiritual kingdom, give the same testimony of conscious acceptance with God through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as do the American, the German, the Englishman, the Greek, and the Jew. And all these give identical testimony with those of the early church, many of whom went to the rack and the stake rather than forsake the consciousness of spiritual life in Christ Jesus. Since science has to do with facts, here are facts which the scientist must not overlook when he is treating of Christianity and the Bible.

The long array of facts regarding the rapid spread of Christianity after the day of Pentecost may also be cited as scientific confirmation of the spiritual life. It must be remembered that the votaries of Christianity were, in the main, unlettered people, without influential friends, without

Higher Criticism and The Christ

wealth, and without political power. Yet in less than a single year after the crucifixion of the Christ his followers numbered nearly ten thousand; and these were mostly in the vicinity where his blood was shed. In less than two years his gospel had spread over all Judea, and in less than a single century it was preached in Syria and Libya, Egypt and Arabia, Persia and Mesopotamia, Armenia and Parthia, the whole of Asia Minor, and no small part of Europe.

The fact that in later centuries there was a departure from the simplicity of the spiritual life of the early church does not necessarily discredit the Christianity of the Christ. It was and is the divine power inherent in Christianity that makes it the one really evangelical force in the world which is destined to final and universal conquest. Other religions have in them the elements of decay. Christianity has the elements of perpetual life, and as the excrescences which grew upon the church during the dark ages are dropped off one by one, the Christianity of the Christ will finally shine forth in its purity throughout the whole world as it does now in some portions of this earthly heritage.

The burden of the gospel as preached by the early disciples was the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the necessity of the spiritual life. These were facts

Confirmation of the Spiritual

of which they had no doubt. They had seen the Master crucified. They had conversed with him after his resurrection, and had seen him ascend into heaven. They had waited at Jerusalem for the promised signal to spread the gospel, and they had received it by the enduement of spiritual power, such as had never been witnessed before. They could not doubt that this power was from God. The people believed their message and turned toward their standard. Had they been preaching a spurious gospel the people would have been quick to find it out, especially the Jews, at whose instigation the Christ was crucified. Both Jews and pagans united to stop the spread of the gospel. Their opposition was most determined and inveterate. The resources of the Roman government were employed to check the advance of Christianity, and martyrs died by the hundred and by the thousand during the first three centuries. But the gospel of the Christ could not be destroyed. When Peter and other apostles were on trial before the Jews for preaching Jesus and the resurrection, Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, advised his associates, saying, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." Gamaliel uttered the true

Higher Criticism and The Christ

prophecy. The gospel has not been overthrown and cannot be overthrown. Who, then, shall say that it is not from God?

The numerous facts relating to individual Christian experience also form an array of testimony quite as scientific as facts relating to physical science. That the worldly man, or the purely intellectual man, does not accept these facts does not invalidate them. He is not a competent judge because he has not entered upon the spiritual life. The vast army of followers of the Christ are conscious of these facts, and all men might become conscious of them by simply entering, by faith, into the world of spiritual life and spiritual activities.

It must be admitted that the true followers of the Christ are without guile, that they would not under any circumstances give false testimony, for the contrary would invalidate their testimony as followers of the Christ. Let it be remembered that their testimony relates to the consciousness of life—spiritual life. Like the Master, the followers of Jesus may exclaim, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen." The Christian's testimony is to that life of which he is as conscious as he is of physical life. His testimony is not of material things, but it is of actual realities. Hence we may justly claim that the testimony of the Christian, re-

Confirmation of the Spiritual

lating to spiritual things, is as conclusive as is "the testimony of the rocks" relating to the material world.

As to individual testimony relating to the spiritual life, the number is legion. Instance that of Saint Paul, who, as Saul of Tarsus, was making a raid upon the Christians of Damascus. On the way he was arrested by a supernatural light and a supernatural voice, by which he was convinced of his mistaken zeal and by means of which he found his way into the spiritual kingdom. From that time on he gave testimony to the spiritual life. He had no doubt about it. Nor can a shadow be cast upon his sincerity as a witness. He left the flatteries and the emoluments of the Jews and the Sanhedrin for the poverty and the persecutions of the followers of the Nazarene. He maintained this testimony "in perils oft" throughout his sublime life, and finally gave his head to the block as the supreme measure of his faith in spiritual life through Christ. He swung into the future world, as an example of all true conquerors, exclaiming, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not

Higher Criticism and The Christ

to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." We challenge the whole world to impeach the testimony of Saint Paul as a sincere and competent witness.

The testimony of John Wesley and the revival which followed his entrance into the spiritual life is a matter of world-wide history. None will accuse him of insincerity or guile. He was born and reared in a materialistic age—an age of sensualism and infidelity. He was a churchman without experience in spiritual things. He was a man of commanding intellect, a scholar of the first order. He came to America as a missionary and returned with a sense of failure. On his way back across the Atlantic he met with a company of Moravians, whose Christian life was to him an enigma, since in the fiercest storm they manifested no fear of death and were always happy in whatsoever state they might be found. They manifested an assurance regarding their present relations with God, as well as their prospects of the future life, which Wesley knew he did not possess. When he had returned to England he was often instructed by these Moravians in "the way of faith." He had a great horror of being deceived, but was conscious that he did not possess that spiritual life which was necessary to salvation from sin and for that power which was needful to

Confirmation of the Spiritual

succeed in bringing a lost world to Christ. He had a friend in Peter Böhler, a Moravian, who had come to full enjoyment of the spiritual life in Christ. Wesley heard the testimony of the Moravians with astonishment, and began to seek, by prayer and fasting, for the spiritual blessing which they enjoyed. At length he attended a little meeting in Aldersgate Street, London, where a few pious souls were wont to meet for prayer and Bible study. Some one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans (it was a description of faith), when Mr. Wesley received the priceless blessing which he had sought. His testimony to the change which he received is thus given in his own words:

"About a quarter to nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for my salvation; and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death. I began to pray with all my might for those who had in a more especial manner despitefully used me and persecuted me. I then testified openly to all there what I now first felt in my heart."

When the meeting was over John Wesley hastened to meet his brother Charles, who had already

Higher Criticism and The Christ

received this rich blessing, and together they rejoiced and praised God for his great salvation. Concerning the results of this experience, we quote from the book John Wesley the Methodist:

“His conversion revolutionized the whole character and method of his ministry. The great evangelical doctrines had been obscured by his sacerdotalism. His moral teaching, lofty as it was, had lacked the inspiration of the mightiest motive—the personal consciousness of God’s love to man and the burning love to God created by the witness of the Spirit. The faith of a servant was transformed into the faith of a son, and from this hour ‘this ritualistic priest and ecclesiastical martinet was to be transformed into a flaming preacher of the great evangelical salvation and life in all its branches and its rich and varied experiences. Hence arose Wesleyan Methodism and all the Methodist churches.’ . . . ‘The Rubicon was crossed. The sweeping aside of ecclesiastical traditions, the rejection of the apostolic succession, the ordination with his own hands of presbyters and bishops, the final organization of a separate and fully equipped church, were all logically involved in what took place that night.’ ”

The personal experience of John Wesley on that night in Aldersgate was but a repetition of the ex-

Confirmation of the Spiritual

perience of many who had preceded him, though few had turned it to so great account. The marvelous fortitude of the early Christians, many of whom endured the most cruel forms of martyrdom, was all because of the awakening to that spiritual life in the soul which set John Wesley on his errand of evangelism—an evangelism which has encircled the world. This consciousness of present salvation from sin, of acceptance with God through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, has characterized multitudes of the rank and file of the Wesleyan and Methodist churches, as well as many of the other churches. The unspeakable joy at conversion and the shouts of triumph in the hour of death are facts as scientific as other facts, and must be dealt with by the true scientist, who does not emasculate from his system some of the most pronounced manifestations of life. Let it again be noted that, while many of the theories of natural science change with the progress of investigation, the manifestations of the spiritual life go on the same and will go on the same forever. That there have been unwarranted and even false manifestations in the name of the Christian life does not invalidate nor discredit the true life in Christ Jesus. Nor will it do to urge that the spiritual life in Christ cannot be comprehended, since physical science concedes that physical life cannot be com-

Higher Criticism and The Christ

prehended. No life is comprehensible by the human intellect. Both physical and spiritual life have been created by the Infinite and are comprehensible only by the Infinite. Yet we finite beings are conscious of life, physical and spiritual.

It was in a somewhat different manner than that of Wesley, though in the same spirit, that Luther received the consciousness of spiritual life in Christ. He had been groping in the dark. He had sought vainly by acts of penance to find peace with God and a consciousness of acceptance with him. It was while climbing the marble stairs at Rome, on his knees, that the truth flashed upon his troubled soul, "The just shall live by faith." He arose from his knees a changed man. He believed, and so entered into that spiritual life which filled his soul with peace and which made him the champion of the great Reformation.

The critics have decried the day of Pentecost and affirmed that the Christian church was not established by what they are pleased to term a "cataclysm." But what of the repeated cataclysms that have occurred since then? How are those outpourings of the Holy Spirit to be accounted for which repeat to a greater or less extent the story of the day of Pentecost? What is God's answer to the higher critical skepticism of to-day? It is the revival of

Confirmation of the Spiritual

his work of grace by means of which thousands are gathered into the kingdom, given in answer to the prayers of those who accept and believe God's Word. The noted Welsh revival which has become famed throughout the Christian world was preceded by an extended series of doctrinal sermons by the evangelist R. A. Torrey, who himself was once a radical higher critic, but who came to discover the error of his way and returned to the fold of traditional Christianity. His sermons, preached in Cardiff, were published in the daily papers and were extensively read by the public throughout Wales. Soon after, the revival began spontaneously in different places, without any recognized human leader, the one most nearly approaching leadership being a young man of twenty-six, Evan Roberts, who left his studies in a divinity school to go and preach the gospel to the young people of his native town. Concerning himself this young man says:

"God has made me glad, and I am showing others the great joy of serving him, a joy so great and so wonderful that I shall never be able to express it in its completeness. . . . His Spirit came to me one night, when upon my knees I asked him for guidance, and five months later I was baptized with the Spirit. He has led me as he will lead others who, conscious of their human weakness, lean upon him

Higher Criticism and The Christ

as children upon a father. I know that the work which has been done through me is not due to any human ability that I possess. It is his work and to his glory."

Rev. J. Campbell Morgan, who visited Wales for the purpose of inspecting this revival, says:

"I have noticed some of the essential peculiarities. I say to you to-day, beloved, without any hesitation, that this whole thing is of God, that it is a visitation in which he is making men conscious of himself, without any human agency. The revival is far more widespread than the fire zone. In this sense you may understand that the fire zone is where the meetings are actually held, and where you feel the flame that burns. But even when you come out of it, and go into railway trains, or into a shop, a bank, anywhere, men everywhere are talking of God. Whether they obey or not is another matter. There are thousands who have not yielded to the restraint of God, but God has given Wales in these days a new conviction and a new consciousness of himself. That is the profound thing, the underlying truth."

Some unbelievers have sought to belittle the significance of the Welsh revival by styling it "an ethical revival." They say, "These people have received a sudden impulse to pay their debts, square their accounts, refrain from profanity and immo-

Confirmation of the Spiritual

rality, and deal justly with their neighbors." There is indeed an ethical reformation, but it is the result and not the cause of the revival. All this ethical achievement is the legitimate effect of the general awakening to spiritual life. Without spiritual life there would be no "ethical" revival. With the awakening to spiritual life there must follow the ethical adjustment, for the man possessed of spiritual life is honest, brave, and true. "He that is born of God doth not commit sin."

The revival spirit spread from Wales to London and to the Continent. Rev. Dr. A. C. Dixon, the eminent Baptist pulpiteer, observing the conditions in London, declared that the circumstance most in evidence was the universal use of the Bible. And it was a notable fact that whenever the validity of the Bible or any part of it was called in question the working influence of the Holy Spirit sensibly ceased and the revival spirit was quenched. But with the acceptance of the Word was fulfilled the prophecy of Joel as on the day of Pentecost: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit."

THE BIBLE AS A TEXT-BOOK

CHAPTER XII

THE BIBLE AS A TEXT-BOOK

IN the study of natural science it has been found convenient to formulate various text-books. Thus authors have formulated books on mathematics. We have systems on arithmetic and algebra, geometry and trigonometry, surveying and calculus. It is not often that the thought of the student goes beyond the author of any one of these systems. The author is looked upon as a kind of inventor, and he is held in awe by those who attempt to comprehend the principles and the problems which he has given them to solve. But why should not the student be first taught that the supreme mathematician of the universe is God. The authors of books on mathematics strive to comprehend the mind of the Infinite, and they think God's thoughts after him. The multiplication table, addition, subtraction, division, square root, algebra, and geometry are not for this world alone. They extend throughout the whole universe. Were it possible for a mathematical genius to be translated to another world of created intelligences, he would find there the same principles and probably a similar field for his mathematical genius that he finds in this world. The worlds of

Higher Criticism and The Christ

space are weighed in the same balances and measured by the same rules that obtain in this world. Each little system of mathematics, however insignificant it may seem to the student, is a part of the mathematical universe.

Likewise we may mention the science of chemistry. The spectrum has revealed that the alchemy of the Almighty runs through all the worlds of space. The constituent elements of this world, numbering at least eighty, are found to be contained in the constituent elements of the sun, of the various planets, and of the distant stars that shine above us. So that the chemist who has learned to fuse various elements in this world, changing and then rechanging them from one condition to another, would find essentially the same conditions were he to awaken upon some other inhabited world of space. However skilled the chemist may become in his scientific investigations, he but discovers God's thoughts and methods, thinking God's thoughts after him.

And so with all other forms of natural science. God is the God of nature as well as of revelation, and nature in this world is nature in all worlds. We do not know what kind of intelligences may inhabit other worlds. Upon some of them may be innocent beings who have never known the consequences of sin. Perhaps they walk with God in

The Bible as a Text-Book

pristine innocence. But the natural elements which surround them are akin to the elements which surround us in this world, with the possible exception that their worlds may not have been cursed by the consequences of sin. One thing, however, we do know—that God is over all, blessed for evermore.

Now, upon all the various natural sciences God has permitted men to work out his thoughts after him. They are found in the different treatises and systems which are studied in the family circle and in our colleges and schools. Sometimes the treatise is found to be erratic, which shows that the author has not always thought aright. But God's thoughts remain, more enduring than the everlasting hills. The evidences of his thoughts in nature are contained in the manifestations of the natural world. God says, "Study nature and learn my thoughts respecting material things."

But has God shut out the thought of man from the spiritual world? Why, then, was man created a spiritual being? If man is not a spiritual being he cannot claim exaltation above the merely animal world. But man has life that the animal world does not and cannot know. Man is spirit as well as matter and mind, and God says to man, "Learn of me the principles of righteousness, of obligation, of morality, of spirituality and eternal life." That

Higher Criticism and The Christ

men might have a text-book relating to the spiritual life, God commissioned men, well versed in the spiritual life, to write the Scriptures. These men also thought God's thoughts after him. Those thoughts are embodied in the Bible. The Bible is not a treatise on the natural sciences. It is not a system on mathematics or on chemistry or on astronomy. It has to do with the sciences of the spiritual world. In this sphere it has no rival and can never have a rival. The Bible is God's text-book, given to men that they may become versed in the science of that righteousness which extends to all worlds and to all intelligences—to all the universe. The central figure of the Bible is God, manifested in Jesus Christ. He says, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

Let it also be understood that God's text-book on the spiritual life is permanent. It needs no revision. Though it may be found desirable to revise its translations, the book itself—that is, the substance of the book—cannot be improved by revision. Authors of books on the natural sciences often change and revise their text-books, to keep up with the advancing fruits of investigation. But who would think of improving upon the Bible as a text-

The Bible as a Text-Book

book for advancement in the spiritual life? Let all the world of scholars, all the scientists and philosophers of all the ages, come together, if that were possible, and set to work to improve upon God's text-book on the spiritual life. What a botch it would be! What a disagreement concerning morals, laws, ethical standards, ideas about the future, of obligation of man to man and of man to God! Such a Bible would be a system of compromises, and when it came before the public would be a laughing-stock, to be ridiculed by all mankind.

On the other hand, the Bible, though fifteen hundred years in building, is one book, and when rightly interpreted is without contradiction of one part with another. The thread of spiritual harmony runs through it from beginning to end. It is the one book, the only book, that meets the requirements of the human soul. What soul has ever been changed from a dishonest, impure life to a life of purity and holiness by the reading of Bacon's philosophy or Shakespeare's plays, or any other merely intellectual production. But the Bible, falling into the hands of sinful men has been the means of the conversion of thousands. Sometimes only a leaf of the Scriptures found upon a lonely shore has been the means of transformation of sinful lives. The Bible is the one book that meets the needs of human hearts.

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Why, then, can the Bible not be improved? Because it is the only working system for the salvation of the race. Every text-book, to be of use, must prove itself a working system. Of what use in this day would be a text-book on astronomy advocating and demonstrating the Ptolemaic system? Of what use a text-book on mathematics attempting to demonstrate that two and two make five? Of what use a text-book on chemistry declaring that there is no need of fixed ratios as the foundation of substances? Authors of such books would be kindly cared for in a lunatic asylum. But what of the critics who are continually formulating new theories in their attempt to make a new working system for the salvation of men, contrary to the plan of redemption as given in God's Word? Who are these who presume to revise, redact, and edit out of all semblance of meaning and historic truthfulness God's own statements of his provisions and conditions of salvation? No wonder they have failed to formulate a working system, for "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." The experience of the race abundantly proves this declaration. Jesus Christ is the only Saviour. He is the center, the meaning, and the interpretation of all Scripture.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

THE Christianity of the Bible is founded upon God, manifested in the person of Jesus Christ.

The science of the material world cannot be made to interpret the science of the spiritual world.

The science of the spiritual world, however, affords the only clear interpretation of the science of the material world.

The intellectualism which ignores God either in nature or in revelation is immoral and leads to worst forms of vice and sin.

Whatever may be the gyrations of the critical positions, yet, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

The manifestations of the office and work of the Holy Spirit in the world demonstrate that God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.

The intellectualism which recognizes and fears God takes on the forms of righteousness, and results in continuous and mighty uplift to the human race.

The critics who go to matter to explain spiritual manifestations must always suffer confusion and humiliation. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."

Higher Criticism and The Christ

Any conception of revelation which locks up the Infinite, and his eternal purpose, to the momentary fragment of a merely human view, however uplifted, is no revelation of God. It may be a revelation of the conceits of a self-exalted critic.

Since God the Father communicates his will and love to his human children, we, his children, should expect to have to revise our ideas to accord with his infinite wisdom, and not to revise his wisdom to suit our passing and unenlightened whims.

The college or university professor who darkens the light of Christian homes, and poisons the life of young men and women, by administering the poison of skepticism to his pupils, in either homeopathic or alopathic doses, will have much to answer for.

